The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXIV, No. 4 April, 1951

CONTENTS

Cause of Our Joy . . . . . . *James A. Magner* 241

The Heroic Virtues of Venerable Pope Pius X
Joseph B. Collins, S.S. 248

Humani generis and the Fathers of the Church
Thomas B. Falls 262

The Purpose of the Missions . . *Patrick O'Connor* 272

The Meaning of the Church's Necessity for Salvation.
Part III . . . . . . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 290

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Station of the Cross Problem 303

Ordo to be Followed 303

Ash Wednesday Problem 304

Manner of Imposing Ashes on Clerics 304

Orationes imperatae 305

Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament 305

Thanksgiving After Mass 305

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1951, by The Catholic University of America Press

(Contents Continued from Previous Page)

Indulgences Attached to Breviary 306

First Mass Indulgence 306

Blessing of St. Blase 306

The Proxy Godparent 307

An Obstetrical Problem 308

ANALECTA 310

BOOK REVIEWS

Patrologie, 2nd edition, *by Berthold Altaner* 315

Patrology, Vol. I, *by Johannes Quasten* 316

The Left Hand of God, *by William E. Barrett* 319

Many Colored Fleece, *edited by Sister Mariella Gable, O.S.B.* 319

BOOK NOTES 320

EVERY CATHOLIC EDUCATOR, SCHOOL, and PRIEST

should subscribe to

The Catholic Educational Review

Edited under the direction of

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Department of Education

MARCH 1951 CONTENTS:

- ● **Routine in Catholic Education** . . . . **Rev. Edward F. Garesche, S.J.**
- ● **Must Latin be Drudgery?** . . . . **Rev. William G. Most**
- ● **Balance that Mind!** . . . . **Rev. Thomas J. Brennan, C.S.C.**
- ● **Logic and English** . . . . **Sister Mary Aquin, I.H.M.**
- ● **Interpretation of Scores on Advanced Test in Education** . . . . **John P. Treacy, Ph.D.**
- ● **The Status of Catholic Junior Colleges** . . **Rev. Joseph B. Tremonti, C.S.V.**
- ● **Dante and Our Lady** . . . . **Sister Mary Regina, S.S.J.**

Subscription Price: **U. S., Canada and Foreign $3.50**
Single Number 40 cents

Address: THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL REVIEW
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON 17, D. C.

CAUSE OF OUR JOY

In the art, literature, and devotion of the Blessed Virgin Mary, it is often difficult to say which theme is dominant and more characteristic, that of joy or of sorrow. Devotion to the Sorrowful Mother, recalled in the Seven Dolors and in the prophecy of Simeon—"Thy own soul a sword shall pierce, that out of many hearts thoughts may be revealed"—plays a leading part in the prayers of Christians to the Blessed Mother.[1] This is only logical, as recollection of the passion and death of her Divine Son comes uppermost in typifying His infinite love and act of Redemption. The poverty and obscurity of the Saviour's birth in a manger, the circumstances leading to the slaughter of the innocents by Herod and the flight of the Holy Family into Egypt, the conspiracy of Christ's enemies, and the bloody culmination of His earthly career on Calvary, all come to mind in tracing the career of Mary. This chain of events, which would spell frustration and sorrow in any normal life, was certainly not made less poignant in her sorrowing heart by the fact that she knew her Son was the Son of God, teaching the eternal truth and doing penance for the sins of men.

Nevertheless, the Blessed Virgin emerges from these sorrows, not as a grieving or disconsolate figure, like Rachel, but rather as one who has known how to bear and conquer sorrow. There is no suggestion of moroseness or frustration in her character. On the contrary, in each case of adversity, the Holy Scriptures refer to her as turning sorrow into joy and of meeting harsh reality with optimistic determination.

This observation is of special significance for a philosophy of Christian living and in the formation of the Catholic mind. Since Mary was the Mother of Christ, she may also be regarded as the first Christian and indeed as the exemplar of all Christians. It is only logical that her view of life and her reactions, in the presence of joy or sorrow, should be indicative of basic attitudes in all who cultivate her devotion and strive for the Christian way of life.

Despite her unique character, because of the divine personality of her Son, the general movement of events, particularly in their domestic setting, does not differ substantially from that in the life of the average person. The childhood of Christ and her life with St. Joseph do not offer any evidence of other than a quiet, joyful home life. Her interest in social life and her solicitude that all should go smoothly are exemplified in the wedding feast of Cana, when she suggested that her Divine Son perform a miracle to replenish the wine. While the Gospels do not mention the time or the circumstances of the death of St. Joseph, we must surmise that it did not leave her prostrated with rebellious grief or unable to carry on her tasks. And when Christ began his public mission, she entered into His work with enthusiasm and fidelity. She served as a bearer of strength and counsel to the Apostles, even after the death and resurrection of Christ. This is not the story of a pessimistic or inherently sorrowful woman.

---

[1] *Luke* 2:35.

It is interesting to note also that, whereas the sorrowful mysteries of the Rosary are devoted to the death and passion of Christ, the joyful mysteries are those devoted to His Blessed Mother—the Annunciation, the Visitation of her cousin Elizabeth, the Finding of the Boy Christ in the Temple, the Assumption of the Body of the Blessed Virgin into Heaven, and her heavenly Coronation as Queen of the Saints.

The apparitions of the Blessed Virgin at various times and places, as at Lourdes, Fatima, Guadalupe, and LaSalette, have, it is true, been associated with elements of keen suffering and anguish for the participants. But her appearance has always been described as that of an exceedingly beautiful woman, clothed in glory. And her messages have always been positive, of hope and the way to happiness even on earth.

It is supremely important that this aspect of Mary's personality and message be stressed in Catholic education and devotion. Otherwise, only a partial and possibly distorted view of the Christian way of life may result.

The prayer "to thee do we cry, poor banished children of Eve; to thee do we send up our sighs, mourning and weeping in this valley of tears" may otherwise leave an altogether false impression of God's beautiful creation and the joy He intends we should take in orderly living. The life of the Blessed Virgin demonstrates that sorrow, pain, and disappointment are external and can exist with true peace of soul and happiness.

Devotion to the Blessed Virgin under the title "Our Lady of

Sorrows" pays honor to the sufferings which she shared with her Son, and it appeals for her consolation and encouragement to bear our burdens in dark hours. But it is not and must not become confused with melancholy or moroseness of spirit. Christianity is essentially a religion of joy—the joy of the heart living in the presence of God—and it is by understanding this as the normal way of life, that we understand how the Virgin, even as Our Lady of Sorrows, is the cause of our joy.

Needless to say, this view of the world and of the challenge of living on this terrestrial sphere creates a definite pattern of activity based on the recognition of certain values. For one thing, it points logically to the determined cultivation of a cheerful imagination and a realistic optimism; and it brings the virtue of charity down to earth in workable forms, through the development of the arts of good manners, courtesy, thoughtfulness, appreciation, and articulate gratitude. By so simple an art as her intervention at the marriage feast of Cana, the Blessed Virgin rebukes that lack of concern which is often falsely called holy indifference, and she teaches that good intentions are of merit for the next life only if they are harnessed and put to work in this life in tangible ways.

The mind which is so concerned with heaven that it has no time for the things of earth, or dismisses human joys and the amenities of kind and gracious living as incompatible with or superfluous to Christianity, should re-examine itself in the light of the example of the Blessed Virgin. Her visit with her cousin Elizabeth, following the annunciation of the angel that she was to become the mother of God, is proof of her concern for the courtesies of life. Nothing could better demonstrate her desire to share her great joy and willingness to take counsel. Throughout her simple but sublime life, the supernatural virtues are constantly identified with natural earthly common-sense, decency, and human consideration, the same as with her Divine Son. Conversely, she shows that joyous living is not only compatible with great sanctity, but is actually the basis and natural companion of it. There is no one so earthly or engrossed in the tasks of his trade who cannot lift his heart to God and sanctify himself through cheerful activity and joyous living.

The same great principles appear applicable to intellectual and cultural development. We are told by the Gospels that as a youth Jesus "grew and waxed strong, full of wisdom, and the grace of

God was in Him."[2] Recognizing the infinite wisdom of Christ as of the second person of the Holy Trinity, we are still confronted with the fact that, as a human being, He grew in knowledge and wisdom. Clearly, this development was under the direction of His Blessed Mother and His foster father St. Joseph. Even as a child, Christ had a dynamic appreciation of the life about Him. Throughout His life, no phase of nature or human activity escaped Him. In His parables, he drew from the experience of the farmer, the fisherman, the tax gatherer, the merchant, the housewife, the builder, the ruler. He dealt with every class of society, always on equal terms—from the poor lepers to the scribes and pharisees of the Temple, and with Pilate himself, first representative of the Roman emperor. He did not fear knowledge or shirk from the horizons of knowledge; nor did he hesitate to put His knowledge to good use.

While it is inconceivable that the Blessed Mother, as a purely human being, was able to follow to the heights of the knowledge and wisdom of her Divine Son's mind, still it is apparent that she possessed a broad understanding and profound sense of values. In reference to the marvelous events attendant on the birth of Christ, the Scripture notes significantly that Mary kept all this in her heart, which is to say that she observed and remembered well. During His own growth into manhood and during His public career, Christ certainly must have shared with her some of that deeper insight which He communicated in part through His public revelations. It was largely drawing from her information and grasp of events that the Apostles were able to record the early events of Christ's life, and we know that they were still gathered about her, for counsel and inspiration, when the Holy Ghost descended upon them assembled on Pentecost Day.

All this is sufficient to sweep into the discard any notion that learning is dangerous and evil, that scientific progress is the work of the devil, and that probing into the secrets of nature can come to no good. Such intellectual manichaeism, under one form or the other, however piously disguised, consigning this world to the devil and limiting spiritual growth to devotions of petition and penance, is entirely at odds with the fact that all creation is from the hand of God. All creation reveals His mind, His beauty, His wisdom, His power, and His justice. If the human mind is not attuned to this and designed to learn more of God through knowledge of His creation, to the full extent it is able, then our conception of divine goodness and beauty must be revised to meet a crooked view of the universe and a sinister regard of its Maker.

---

[2] *Luke* 2:40.

As cause of our joy, the Blessed Virgin cannot be advanced as an exponent of the adage "If ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise." Nor can her example be used to justify the notion that only certain kinds of wisdom and knowledge are good and valuable, namely, the *specifically* religious and devotional. She cannot rightly be made to serve as the exponent of mediocrity in education, as if people would be better at their prayers and need to prepare themselves for teaching or preaching or professional or vocational activity only to the extent required to satisfy external requirements and to "get by" in this world. Nor is there anything in the life and mental attitude of the Blessed Virgin to justify a reaction of half-smirk and half-fear towards those who give their lives to extending the boundaries of human knowledge through study, research, teaching, and writing.

She who uttered the immortal *Magnificat* "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour" was most certainly gifted with a deeply poetic spirit. While her means may not have permitted her the cultivation of the fine arts, it is obvious that she enjoyed the beauty of God in all His handiwork and made proper use of this good gift. A prototype of the truly great, perceptive, and poetic mind, she was naturally humble and consciously aware of the value of humility; but this did not prevent her from taking an equally realistic, historical perspective of her position in the redemptive act or of her importance to all mankind. "Because He hath regarded the humility of His handmaid," she declared, "Behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. Because He that is mighty hath done great things to me, and holy is His name."[3]

With the understanding of the mind and outlook of the Blessed Mother, the reason for the great sorrows in her life, according to the design of Divine Providence, becomes clearer. If she had been spared sorrow and pain and had lived her life in a tower of ivory, so to speak, her example could hardly be cited for the rest of us mortals. In the nature and course of events, we must put up with considerable pain, reverses, and discouragement. But she has shown that as sorrow and grief, arising from various causes, are part of God's plan, they are not inconsistent with a joyous existence. They may, in fact, even contribute to it, through growth of knowledge and character, through experience in avoiding pit-falls, and through that enlarged sympathy and understanding which give meaning to friendship, love, and social charity.

---

[3] *Luke* 1:46-48.

The Blessed Mother's highest and most distinctive claim to the title "Cause of Our Joy" is, of course, her intimate sharing in the redemptive character and acts of her Divine Son, even to His death upon the cross, which she witnessed. It is this fact also which gives unique significance to her life and every action. There have been numerous sages and saints, pagan, Jew, and Christian, who have exemplified a positive, expansive, and joyous conception of virtue, of learning, working, and of living in general. But from her special position as mother of Christ, the Redeemer of the human race, she speaks and acts with a finality of indication which leaves no room for reasonable doubt.

Inasmuch as spiritual peace, the result of union or reconciliation with God, is the condition requisite for all true joy, Mary may be called, in a truly theological sense, the cause of our joy, precisely as the mother of the Redeemer. For in her divine maternity, she fulfilled the plan of Almighty God to bring His eternal Son into the world, made flesh for the reconciliation of man with his Maker on a supernatural plane. Through her consent expressed in her immortal reply to the angel, "Be it done unto me according to thy word," she released to mankind the floodgates of divine grace and opened again the vision of eternal happiness face to face in the presence of the Eternal Beauty and Joy.[4] In foresight of her consent, Almighty God had already endowed her soul with sanctifying grace from the first instant of her conception. As mother of the Saviour, she may well be regarded with rejoicing as having, in turn, opened the riches of sanctifying grace to all of us "poor banished children of Eve."

In recognition of her outstanding character as a woman of profound happiness, despite her many sorrows, as an example of Christian joy to the world, and as first co-operator in our eternal redemption, the Church sings her praises throughout the year. But in particular, it commemorates her joy and urges all the faithful to do likewise in the prayer of the Easter season:

---

[4] *Luke* 1:38.

"*Rejoice and be glad, O Virgin Mary, Alleluia.*
"*For the Lord hath truly risen, Alleluia.*

"*O God, who didst vouchsafe to give joy to the world through the resurrection of Thy Son, Our Lord Jesus Christ, grant we beseech Thee that through His mother, the Virgin Mary, we may obtain the joys of everlasting life. Through the same Christ Our Lord. Amen.*"

Cause of our joy, pray for us.

JAMES A. MAGNER

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

ARCHBISHOP SPALDING ON LIBRARIES

What is a Library? It is a judicious collection of books. We say *judicious;* because every collection of books is certainly not a Library. The word implies a variety of works on different subjects, carefully selected and judiciously arranged. A complete Library is one which has the best works of every age and language on all the important subjects of literature and science.

Like those who collect and use them, Libraries may be said to have a body and a soul. By the former, we mean all that is external and material about them—the books themselves, the order of their arrangement, the spacious halls which contain them, and the shelves on which they are placed. By the latter, we mean all the unseen and spiritual treasures which are concealed under these outward forms—the subjects which they treat, the truths which they unfold, and the hidden life with which they are instinct. A Library may, in fact, be said to have many bodies and souls:—as many of each as there are books on its shelves:—but all these souls are blended together into one mass of spiritual life, animated and breathing; as all these bodies form but one great collection of books. A Library is thus a great storehouse of learning, filled with the accumulated literary treasures of the past. To vary the figure, it is a splendid mausoleum of the illustrious literary dead, not erected, like other mausoleums, over their ashes, but enclosing, as in a richly jewelled casket, their immortal minds.

—Archbishop Martin J. Spalding, in *Miscellanea* (Baltimore: John Murphy and Co., 1866), p. 696.

THE HEROIC VIRTUES OF VENERABLE POPE PIUS X

The present Holy Father on September 3, 1950, solemnly decreed that Pope Pius X exercised throughout his life all the Christian virtues to an heroic degree. The saintly Pius X is thus entitled to be called Venerable, and another vital step toward his beatification has been taken. There remains the formal examination and judgment on the alleged miracles of the Servant of God. Even while living many startling proofs of his holy intercession have been attested. What God began during the lifetime of Pius X, He continued in ever-increasing extent since his death. The Church alone, however, can pass on the numerous extraordinary graces and notable favors of the Venerable Pontiff granted to people in all parts of the world. In point of time the Cause of the beatification and canonization of Pope Pius X has proceeded with unusual celerity. "The fame of sanctity which in his life had already surrounded him, at his death burst forth and spread throughout the Catholic world," are the words of the official decree promulgating the heroicity of the virtues of Pius X. "For this cause," the document continues, "the Sacred College of Cardinals itself became Promoter of his Cause."[1]

The promotion of the Cause of Pius X was officially started with a decree signed by the Cardinals in *curia* on Feb. 14, 1923, and the Cardinal Vicar called a meeting to take the introductory steps on June 15 of the same year. Witnesses began to be examined in the following November. Then in due time the Ordinary Processes conducted by the *curie* in Treviso, Mantua, Venice, and Rome—places where the Servant of God lived and worked—were completed. The formal Introduction of the Cause was made on Feb. 12, 1943. The Antepreparatory Congregation of the Virtues was held on Nov. 29, 1949, and a favorable decision was reached. This was followed by the Preparatory Congregation on July 18, 1950, and finally the General Congregation met at Castel Gandolfo in the presence of Pope Pius XII on Aug. 8 and proposed discussion *super dubio* on the heroicity of the virtues of Pius X. The Holy

---

[1] *Decree of Promulgation of the Heroic Virtues of the Venerable Pope Pius X* (Official translation, Rome, 1950), p. 1.

Father, after prolonged deliberation and prayer, gave the formal declaration on Sept. 3 as follows: "It is proved that the Venerable Servant of God, Pope Pius X, exercised in heroic degree the theological virtues of Prudence, Justice, Temperance, Fortitude, and the adjuncts (the moral virtues of Humility, Poverty, Modesty, and Chastity) for the object in question."[2]

An essential condition for heroicity of virtue, according to Benedict XIV and the teaching of theologians, is that the Christian virtues have been exercised not only with perseverance up to death but with readiness and alacrity, with facility and spiritual joy, even in circumstances that are arduous and difficult, and in a way that is wholly beyond the ordinary manner of other Christians.[3] We now have the official assurance of the Holy Father that these conditions were fulfilled in the life and work of Pius X. His decision was given only after completion of the intensive and exhaustive investigation demanded by the Church and after a full report had been made to the Roman Pontiff who is the sole arbiter in such matters. Thousands of pages of testimony were received and recorded from persons of every walk of life, from strangers and from life-long friends of the Servant of God, from members of his own family, from priests, prelates, members of the religious orders and of the laity—all with a single purpose to attest their belief that Pius X "was always quick and ready to do all things joyfully for the glory of God and the salvation of souls notwithstanding difficulties, sacrifices, and tribulations."[4]

The virtues of Pope Pius X can be seen and studied in his long and eventful life; from childhood to old age they were forged in his soul with those precious elements—grace and good will—of which saints are made. Born of poor parents, on June 2, 1835, in the village of Riese in northern Italy, Joseph Sarto early indicated his keen mind, sterling character, and solid piety. His early studies were made at the place of his birth and in the Latin school at the nearby city of Castelfranco. With that deep faith in divine providence that marked his entire life, young Sarto underwent privations and sacrifices to continue his education for the priesthood. Being the eldest of eight surviving children, he saw no possible help from his family. He did not hesitate to go from door to door of his native village asking for a few pennies that would carry him along to his cherished goal. He won a scholarship to the seminary at Padua and the records of the seminary reveal a high scholastic achievement and a wide and genuine interest in those activities which go to the formation of a priest. He taught Catechism to the children of the neighborhood and in his last year was appointed director of ecclesiastical chant and of the seminary choir. He was ordained on Sept. 18, 1858, in the cathedral at Castelfranco.[5]

---

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *De servorum Dei beatificatione et beatorum canonizatione*, Lib. III, c. vi.

[4] *Articuli per il processo apostolico sulle virtù del Servo di Dio Pio Papa X* (Rome: Tipo. della Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1943), p. 137.

FATHER SARTO

The first appointment of Father Sarto was as curate of a poor parish at Tombolo. His pastor was a wise and holy priest whose zeal was hampered by an incurable illness. The young priest spent nine years of unremitting labor in this fertile field. The parish records of those years show how Father Sarto, with tact and skill, reorganized and revitalized the moral and spiritual life of the people. He opened a night school for the illiterate and took the alphabet class and at the same time trained the parish choir and saw to it that the faithful not only attended the divine services regularly but with understanding through his carefully prepared and practical instructions. He fostered vocations to the religious life and out of his meagre purse assisted a number of boys toward the altar. Father Sarto's love for the poor of the parish was deep and impelling. He often deprived himself of the very necessities of life to help those in need. "His property was not his own," wrote the village schoolmaster, "and what he did not need he gave freely to others."[6] Despite heavy demands on his time, he spent long hours teaching the Catechism to the children and of his catechetical instructions we are told that "even the most untrained of his listeners were able to follow them with ease and understanding."[7]

On July 14, 1867, Father Sarto, then thirty-two years of age, was appointed by Bishop Zinelli to the pastorate at Salzano, one of the most favored parishes in the Diocese of Treviso. Here new fields for the zeal and energy of the young pastor were opened up. Enriched by his experience at Tombolo, Father Sarto again distinguished himself by his devoted care for souls, his success in alleviating the temporal wants of his flock, and by his eminent capacity "to be all things to all men." He made himself director of the public school of the city where he insisted that the truths of the faith be carefully and regularly taught, and he set out to improve the lot of the peasants and workers of the district by organizing rural banks and co-operative associations which in the course of time accomplished much to improve the social and economic conditions in northern Italy.[8]

---

[5] Angelo Marchesan, *Papa Pio X* (Rome, 1904), p. 105.

[6] E. Canon Schmitz, *Life of Pius X* (New York, 1917), p. 205.

[7] Vittorino Facchinetti, *L'anima di Pio X* (Milano, 1936), p. 186.

A deadly epidemic of cholera broke out in Salzano in 1870, and Father Sarto gave himself unstintingly to the care of the sick and dying. He risked his life day and night as he went about his work of mercy. For his heroic work during those terrible months the name of this true shepherd is still held in benediction in all that region.

CANON SARTO

After nine years as pastor of Salzano, the faithful labors of Father Sarto were rewarded when he was called to Treviso, seat of the diocese, in 1875. Here three posts of grave responsibility and honor awaited him. He was made canon of the cathedral, chancellor of the diocese, and spiritual director of the diocesan seminary. In each of these difficult assignments he exhibited rare prudence, executive skill, a fine sense of human understanding, and unostentatious piety. He lived at the seminary and took great interest in forming Christ in the hearts of the young aspirants for the priesthood. He taught fundamental religion to the younger students and dogmatic theology to the upper classes, at the same time directing the details of the local chancery office and carrying out the functions of a canon in the liturgical offices of the cathedral chapter. Despite these arduous labors, Canon Sarto organized and taught Catechism classes to children and youth who attended the public schools from which religious education was banned. At length the vice-rector of the seminary protested to the Canon that he was doing too much and should relinquish the work of catechizing children. "It is my duty, am I not their spiritual father?"

---

[8] Anton de Waal, *Life of Pope Pius X* (Milwaukee, 1904), p. 90.

was the answer of the Canon. To him such work was neither beneath his dignity nor was it to be left undone.[9]

At the death of Bishop Zinelli in November, 1879, Canon Sarto, who had served as vicar general for three years, became the vicar capitular and took over the administration of the diocese. No part of his heavy duties were relaxed. His simplicity and good humor endeared him to all. The seminarians loved him. "I am only a poor country pastor," he told them, "and I occupy this place by God's holy will."[10]

Canon Sarto welcomed Bishop Callegari on his arrival as the new bishop of Treviso in February, 1880. The bishop re-appointed the Canon to all the offices that he had held, but not for long. The sterling qualities of mind and soul which he demonstrated in so many ways were recognized by Pope Leo XIII when the See of Mantua became vacant. To this difficult post he named Canon Sarto, who received the news of his appointment pale-faced and in tears.

BISHOP SARTO

Bishop Joseph Sarto was consecrated in Rome on Nov. 16, 1884, and he made his formal entry into Mantua on April 18 of the following year. He found in his diocese conditions which had defied the efforts of two of his immediate predecessors in office. The work of the Church was hampered and opposed by hostile political forces, the clergy were deprived of their financial support by law, the colleges and the seminary were sadly depleted, dangerous errors of thought had crept in from radical sources, the social and economic status of the people was deplorable, and the bad example of some of the priests contributed to drive many of the faithful from the practice of religion. An apostle was badly needed.

Bishop Sarto set to work with indefatigable energy and strength to put his diocese in order. He gave first attention to his seminary. He himself took over classes in theology, canon law, and ecclesiastical chant, and gave the training of his future priests his devoted attention. He held a synod to reform abuses and to enforce the laws of the Church, and in a comparatively short time he won back the clergy to full and loyal service by his own personal example, by pastoral visits, and by clear-cut but humanely administered discipline. He established the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in every parish and he went about instructing the people both young and old, in churches, on confirmation tours, in schools and in homes. All this with his simple and fatherly pastoral letters gradually effected a moral and religious restoration of the entire diocese. An authority of the time thus writes of Bishop Sarto's work: "Restless Mantua, under the guidance of a chief pastor who was meek and humble of heart as was the divine Master, became a city where peace and order reigned. The reputation of the Servant of God for zeal, piety, and prudence in the government of his diocese was so widely diffused that Cardinal Parocchi (Vicar of Rome) said one day that the best bishop in that region was Monsignore Sarto."[11]

---

[9] F. A. Forbes, *Life of Pius X* (London, 1918), p. 71.

[10] Schmitz, *op. cit.*, p. 222.

The nine years that Bishop Sarto passed in Mantua were fruitful. God blessed his labors on behalf of all classes of his flock. In one of his reports to the Holy See, Bishop Sarto simply enumerated the improvements that had come to his attention during his administration and then he added significantly, "I write this not to praise myself, for even though I have done my duty, I am nevertheless a useless servant."[12] An apostle had indeed come to Mantua!

CARDINAL SARTO

"We congratulate you, Our beloved son, who has guided so worthily the Church of Mantua—truly as a good shepherd of the people." These are the words of Leo XIII written to Bishop Sarto early in 1893. A few months later, on June 12, Bishop Sarto was created Cardinal and in a public consistory held on June 15, he was named Patriarch of Venice. On his return from Rome with the red hat of Cardinal, he visited Riese and was greeted by his aged mother amid the exclamations of joy from his old friends and neighbors. It was nearly fifty years since they had seen him trudging his way to school with his shoes slung over his shoulder and with a piece of bread in his pocket.

The Venetians took their Cardinal to their hearts, and for nearly ten years on ever-widening scale he labored and preached and prayed. It was Tombolo, Salzano, Mantua, all over again; the same care for his clergy, for his seminary, the ever-willing hand and heart extended to the poor, the long hours spent in teaching.

---

[11] Facchinetti, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

[12] De Waal, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

It was the same sympathetic and helpful concern for the social and economic life of his people, the same life of humility and holiness—only the external crimson of the cardinalate had replaced the black and purple of former days as priest and prelate. Honors to him meant only increased responsibilities. "Un pò di fumo," he described them.[13]

The long and fruitful pontificate of Leo XIII drew to a close on June 20, 1903. Cardinal Sarto, after almost forty-five years of faithful work in the Lord's vineyard, at the age of sixty-eight, with his eyes on his many projects in Venice, set out for the papal conclave in Rome. The rest is history.

POPE PIUS X

Joseph Cardinal Sarto was elected Pope on Aug. 4, 1903. As supreme pastor of all Christians, he set forth the aim of his pontificate in his first Encyclical—"to restore all things in Christ." His great task, now on a world-wide scale, was an extension of the self-sacrificing devotion to souls which had marked the years as pastor, bishop, and patriarch. The reign of Pope Pius X was one of the most fruitful in the long history of the Church. Even a cursory review of it will show forth a flowering of the virtues of the saintly Pontiff in the great accomplishments to which his name is forever linked.

The over-all aim of Pius X was to save the world from what he, on the vantage point of Peter's throne, saw was "apostasy from God." There must be a religious, a moral, and a social restoration of the Christian world. It must first of all involve formation of holy priests who in turn will bring religious instruction to the people; and it must be accomplished by charity.[14] During the first years of his pontificate, he directed the reorganization of seminaries in order to provide the best possible training for candidates to the priesthood and to inculcate in his priests throughout the world a deep and abiding consciousness of their sacred vocation. The *Exhortation to the Catholic Clergy* of Aug. 4, 1908, was a labor of love which the Pontiff wrote on the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination. Cardinal Merry del Val tells us that the Pope wrote

[13] Unpublished letter of June 30, 1880, in Museo di Pio X, Riese.

[14] *E supremi apostolatus*, *ASS*, XXXVI (1903-1904), 129-39.

it out, "page by page with his own hand during intervals of spare time in little over a fortnight. It was exclusively his own personal effort."[15] It reflects the Pope's own years of prayer, meditation, and self-sacrificing devotion to Christ.

POPE AND CATECHIST

"What can I do for the Church?" asked a noble lady of Pius X at a private audience. "Teach the Catechism," was the prompt reply. He repeatedly pointed out that the pastors of souls were not alone responsible for religious instruction of others. "To instruct the ignorant" is a spiritual work of mercy incumbent upon all. Catechetical education of all was one of the dominant activities in the life of Pius X and upon this he insisted with all the authority of his sacred office. The Encyclical *Acerbo nimis,* On the Teaching of Christian Doctrine, crystallized the traditional position of the Church on religious instruction and brought to bear the Pontiff's own time-tested experience on this important subject. *Acerbo nimis* is the modern "Magna Carta" of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, for to it the Confraternity owes its revival in our time. The provisions of this document enjoining establishment of the Confraternity in every parish throughout the world and for catechetical instruction of children and adults were later incorporated in the Code of Canon Law.[16]

The Pope himself gave simple instructions on the Catechism to the people in one of the courtyards of the Vatican on Sunday afternoons and he personally directed the composition and publication of a graded catechism in three parts, now known as the *Catechism of Pius X*. In a letter to the Cardinal Vicar, he ordered it to be the official text for the province of Rome and recommended it for use throughout Italy.[17] Twenty-one documents bearing directly upon catechetical instruction issued from the pen of Pius X during the years of his Pontificate, and there are in addition eleven official documents directed to other matters which nevertheless have explicit reference to and directives for the teaching of religion.[18]

---

[15] Cardinal Merry del Val, *Memories of Pope Pius X* (London, 1939), p. 38.

[16] Canons 711:2, 1326-27; 1329-1335.

[17] English translation by T. S. Byrne, *Short Catechism* (New York, 1906). A translation of the Third Part, for secondary schools and beyond, is distributed throughout the four volumes of *A Compendium of Catechetical Instructions* by J. Hagan (New York, 1928).

POPE OF THE EUCHARIST

From the day of his own First Communion at the age of 12, Pius X was ardently devoted to the Holy Eucharist. Witnesses at the canonical processes on the virtues of the Servant of God attest in great number to his recollection while celebrating the Holy Sacrifice, and the intimates of his household tell of the long hours of the night spent in silent adoration of his Eucharistic Lord. This love of the Blessed Sacrament went out into action in two of the great reforms for which the faithful everywhere are eternally grateful: his decrees on frequent and daily Holy Communion and on early Communion for children.

The first of the decrees appeared on Dec. 20, 1905, with this self-explanatory title: "On the Necessary Dispositions for Frequent and Daily Communion."[19] All hesitancy in this respect was at an end, and the faithful undeterred by unwarranted custom, could realize the ardent desires of the Church for them to frequent the Holy Table. "Holy Communion is the shortest and surest way to heaven," said the Pope on one occasion.[20] He extended the decree on Feb. 14, 1906, to permit daily communicants to gain special Indulgences even without the condition of weekly confession; and on Sept. 15, 1906, the Sacred Congregation of the Council formally recommended the frequent Communion of children who had already made their First Holy Communion.[21]

The famous decree *Quam singulari* was promulgated on Aug. 8, 1910. It revived throughout the Church the ancient custom of early Communion for children who "in their tender years may be united to Jesus Christ, may live His life, and obtain protection from all dangers of corruption."[22] This was the word for which many had long waited and prayed; and the touching scenes of today as millions of children in their fresh innocence approach the altar for the first time are due under God to Pope Pius X.

---

[18] Joseph B. Collins, *Catechetical Documents of Pope Pius X* (Paterson, 1946), p. 53.

[19] *ASS,* XXXVIII (1905-1906), 400-406. For translation: Collins, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-49.

[20] Letter, *Qui pridiem*, *AAS*, III (1911), 314.

[21] *ASS,* XXXIX (1906), 62.

[22] *AAS,* II (1910), 578; for translation: Collins, *op. cit.*, pp. 54-62.

The reform of ecclesiastical music was but one of the outpourings of the Pontiff's love for the Eucharist. Most exacting in carrying out the rubrics of the divine offices, he ordered all profane music to be banned from the services of the Church and his *Motu proprio* on the restoration of sacred music exhibited his personal experience and proficiency in such matters. He brought back the plain chant, the official music of the Church, and he pointed out how ecclesiastical music forms an integral part of the sacred liturgy. "By its sweet harmony, plain chant and sacred music ought to increase the devotion of the faithful," he wrote in a pastoral letter in May, 1895.[23] It was not the wish of the Pope to abolish all polyphonic music, as he expressly states; and with characteristic openness of mind he welcomed good music from modern composers; his sole condition being that sacred music must be kept within the limits prescribed by the canons of liturgical propriety and good taste.[24]

THE POPE OF CATHOLIC ACTION

In the field of social action, the work of Pius X stands between Leo XIII and Pius XI. The latter Pontiff referred in *Quadragesimo anno* to the work of his predecessor and affirmed that Pius X was careful to adapt the teachings of Leo XIII to changing conditions, that he never relaxed in paternal solicitude and pastoral constancy, particularly in defense of the poor and of the weak.[25] Social problems had always occupied much of the time of Pius X during the years of his diocesan ministry, and his many directives as Pope which were aimed to remedy social and economic ills in Italy were universally applicable. For the re-christianization of society on a permanent basis, the aid of the laity is essential. This was the plan of Pius X. "They are your helpers," he wrote to the bishops of the world. "Not according to their own views and inclinations but always under the direction and orders of the bishops."[26]

---

[23] Benedetto Pierami, *The Life of the Servant of God*, Pius X (Turin, 1929), p. 165.

[24] Merry del Val, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

[25] *Forty Years After: On Reconstructing the Social Order*, approved text (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1943), p. 93.

[26] *E supremi apostolatus*, *ASS*, XXXVI (1903-1904), 132.

Pius X thus added substantially to our knowledge of the principles of Catholic Action which Pius XI so aptly defined as "the participation and the collaboration of the laity with the Apostolic Hierarchy."[27] For Pius X, Catholic Action was one of the choicest means to "restore all things in Christ," and thus he wrote to his own generation of Catholics: "All the good works of which Catholic laymen are the chief supporters and promoters, and whose form varies according to the special need of each country, constitute what is generally known by a distinctive, and surely, a very noble name: *Catholic Action* or *Action of Catholics*."[28] In these and similar documents, Pius X became the first Pontiff to make frequent use of the term "Catholic Action" to designate the apostolate of the laity in the mission of the hierarchy.[29]

POPE AND SOLDIER OF CHRIST

Pius X would have considered himself a lowly soldier in Christ's army, but when occasion demanded he could and did carry out the office of commander-in-chief with intrepid courage and strength. Cardinal Mercier called him a virile pastor and a fearless defender of the rights of the Church; a man of keen insight and decision who pursued his plans with energy and perseverance.[30] He was a lawgiver whose published documents reach the number of 3,322, which included more than 350 encyclicals, letters, and addresses.[31] Pius X planned and directed almost to completion the monumental *New Code of Canon Law* which bears his name, although it was not promulgated until 1917, becoming operative on May 19 of the following year. He reorganized the Roman congregation, revised the Breviary, and established the Pontifical Biblical Institute—all undertakings of supreme importance. His relations with foreign countries in times of growing stress were conducted with amiability and wisdom and at times, when open and friendly policies were out of the question, with patience and fortitude; witness his repudiation of the cultural laws against the rights of the Church that were sanctioned by the government of France. In the battle against Modernism, synthesis of all heresies, he sagaciously uncovered its poison and its subtle errors and by his condemnation rescued the Church from its insidious evils. The eleven years of the pontificate of Pius X have been aptly summarized by the official declaration of the heroic virtues of the Servant of God as follows: "Many undertakings inspired by God and His grace, which in him was not inactive, did he bring to a head for his own perfection and for the increase of the Church, and all these things merited for him even in his lifetime but especially during his pontificate the fame of sanctity."[32]

---

[27] Encyclical Letter, *Non abbiamo bisogno*, "Concerning Catholic Action" (June 29, 1931), N.C.W.C. text, p. 13.

[28] *Il fermo proposito*, p. 748.

[29] See Joseph V. Sommers, "Catholic Action—Lay Apostolate" in *Pope Pius X: A Symposium* (Paterson, 1946), p. 120.

[30] *Lettre pastorale et mandement de Carême de 1915* (Rheims, 1915), p. 6.

[31] René Bazin, *Pius X* (London, 1928), p. 139.

POPE OF THE SUPERNATURAL

A review of the life and work of Pius X, be it ever so brief, will necessarily reflect and exemplify his spiritual depth and holiness. In him virtue in action was sustained and nourished by prayer and penance. The Roman process mentions his heroic love of Christ, his intimate union with God and virtually uninterrupted awareness of the divine presence notwithstanding the heavy demands on his time and strength.[33] Not to be outdone in generosity to the Giver of all graces, the Servant of God practiced a high degree of self-restraint and mortification from his earliest years. It is seen in his complete rejection of superfluities of every kind: in his food, his dress, and in his manner of living, which did not change from the years either as humble curate or occupant of the Vatican palace. To his sisters who once complained when he took food from his table to give to a poor beggar he exclaimed, "The Lord will provide for us, we are not born to eat but to suffer."[34]

Although temperance was habitual with Pius X, the rigors of self-denial were not always of his own choosing. He felt keenly the unjust attacks which were made against him and his close colaborers. He suffered intensely at the unprovoked insults leveled against his person and his policies and the misunderstandings and petty jealousies which would defeat his plans for the good of souls. All of this he bore with heroic patience and a fraternal spirit of forgiveness while he reflected upon the sufferings and trials of the Saviour at the hands of men. Very acutely did the Bishops of Piedmont call Pius X "the Pope of the Supernatural."[35] He reacted inwardly and immediately when confronted with sin. Witnesses at the various processes attest to the purity and delicacy of his conscience. They affirm that scandals caused him to sigh with pain and sorrow, and his sisters related how a report of moral disorder often brought bitter tears to his eyes.[36]

---

[32] *Op. cit.*, p. 2.

[33] *Articuli per il processo apostolico, op. cit.*, p. 117.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 177.

Among the virtues which the Servant of God practiced with such signal perfection is the virtue of hope. It sustained him unfailingly throughout his life. The anchor of hope adorned his episcopal coat-of-arms; it remained the dominant emblem on his papal crest. "Oh Hope," he exclaimed. "Hope that unites me to God and God to me! Recognizing my inability to carry out the responsibilities that have come upon me, I am consoled in the beautiful virtue of hope."[37] Closely allied with hope was the great humility of Pius X. The official declaration of the heroic virtues of the Pontiff reveals his "contempt of temporal things, that profound humility of his which when he was invested with the supreme dignity was used to eradicate, destroy, disperse, build, implant, not to dominate but to serve, not to rest but to labor."[38] He was a model too of the virtue of prudence. It increased in him with each new post of responsibility and honor. All his decisions were preceded by grave thought and deliberation. He sought for and respected the opinions of others. "We shall think about it," he would say, "and ask others who know more about it than I."[39]

The personal holiness of Pius X was evident to all who had the honor and pleasure of meeting him. All felt they were in the presence of a saint. Cardinal Merry del Val says it can be summarized in his "goodness." But withal there was too his natural and unaffected good humor. His was not a "fugitive and cloistered virtue" but a warm and radiant personality. Children loved him, and they instinctively were drawn by his kindly and simple good nature. His smile, we are told, was reassuring, and his laugh could be infectious.[40] Pius X had in him the great qualities of the great saints: the genial friendliness of Thomas More, the love of poverty of Francis of Assisi, and the pastoral zeal of the Curé of Ars.

---

[35] *La fama di santita del Servo di Dio il Papa Pio X nel pensiero del mondo cattolico* (Rome: Monastero di S. Prassede, 1930), p. 18.

[36] *Articuli per il processo apostolico*, p. 161.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 152.

[38] *Op. cit.*, p. 3.

[39] *Articuli per il processo apostolico*, p. 181.

FINIS CORONAT OPUS

As the long shadows of war fell across Europe in 1914, never to be lifted in our time, Pius X, peace-loving to the last, gave up his soul into the hands of God. With serene calm, absorbed in prayer, surrounded by those with whom he had labored, he died on Aug. 20, 1914, rich in virtues but poor in the goods of this world. "I was born poor, I have lived poor, and I wish to die poor," the Pontiff wrote in his last will and testament. Many years before he had eulogized one of his priests in a funeral sermon. Those words might well be applied to him who spoke them: "He was a good priest. And amid the prayers and tears of those who kneel at his bedside, tranquil as the laborer who falls asleep upon the sheaves his arms have gathered, he returns to the Lord."

A half century will soon have passed since Pope Pius X began "to restore all things in Christ." The mighty plan for which he worked and prayed was not completed in his lifetime. "Apostasy from God" is still the fatal ill that besets mankind. "Ignorance of divine things" in young and old, in those of both high and low degree, is appallingly prevalent. Is it too much to ask the Venerable Servant of God to work yet another—a prodigious—miracle that would cause us to see that in teaching the basic ABC's of Christian truth lies the key to solve the problems that weigh so tragically upon the world today?

JOSEPH B. COLLINS, S.S.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

---

[40] Merry del Val, *op. cit.*, p. 33; Katherine Burton, *The Great Mantle* (New York, 1950), p. 210.

HUMANI GENERIS AND THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH

In his recent Encyclical, *Humani generis,* our Holy Father cautions Catholic theologians against the danger of ignoring, or at least of not giving proper attention to, the teaching authority of the Church as exercised in the person of the Roman Pontiff. Not only must Catholic theologians, he warns, shun those errors in faith or morals which the Supreme Pontiff has pronounced heretical, but they must also show a greater respect for his authority when he treats of errors that approach heresy.

And although this sacred Office of Teacher in matters of faith and morals must be the proximate and universal criterion of truth for all theologians, since to it has been entrusted by Christ Our Lord the whole deposit of faith—Sacred Scripture and Divine Tradition—to be preserved, guarded, and interpreted, still the duty that is incumbent on the faithful to flee also those errors which more or less approach heresy, and accordingly "to keep also the constitutions and decrees by which such evil opinions are proscribed and forbidden by the Holy See" [Can. 1324], is sometimes as little known as if it did not exist.[1]

In developing this point His Holiness insists that greater authority must be attached to the Papal Encyclical Letters. Such documents must be heeded even if in them the Popes do not exercise the supreme power of their Teaching Authority. "For these matters are taught with the ordinary teaching authority, of which it is true to say: 'He who heareth you, heareth Me'; and generally what is expounded and inculcated in Encyclical Letters already for other reasons appertains to Catholic doctrine."[2]

---

[1] *Humani generis,* par. 18: "Et quamquam hoc sacrum Magisterium, in rebus fidei et morum, cuilibet theologo proxima et universalis veritatis norma esse debet, utpote cui Christus Dominus totum depositum fidei—Sacras nempe Litteras ac divinam 'traditionem'—et custodiendum et tuendum et interpretandum concredidit, attamen officium, quo fideles tenentur illos fugere errores, qui ad haeresim plus minusve accedant, ideoque 'etiam constitutiones et decreta servare, quibus pravae huiusmodi opiniones a Sancta Sede proscriptae et prohibitae sunt,' nonumquam ita ignoratur ac si non habeatur."

[2] *Humani generis,* par. 20: "Magisterio enim ordinario haec docentur, de quo illud etiam valet: 'Qui vos audit, me audit' (Luc. 10, 16); ac plerumque quae in Encyclicis Litteris proponuntur et inculcantur, iam aliunde ad doctrinam catholicam pertinent."

Consequently, when the Popes, in their official writings, pass judgment on disputed questions, those questions are no longer to be considered open to discussion among theologians. "But if the Supreme Pontiffs in their official documents purposely pass judgment on a matter up to that time under dispute, it is obvious that that matter, according to the mind and will of the same Pontiffs, cannot be any longer considered a question open to discussion among theologians."[3]

The Holy Father then gives a specific example of what he means by this lack of proper respect for Papal Encyclicals when he condemns those theologians who, in matters concerning the constitution of the Church, give less credence to the precise words of the Encyclicals than they do to the obscure expressions they claim to have found in the writings of some ancient Church Fathers. These same theologians further err when they assume that the modern Papal decrees must be explained from, and in accordance with, the teachings found in early patristic writings.

> What is expounded in the Encyclical Letters of the Roman Pontiffs concerning the nature and constitution of the Church is deliberately and habitually neglected by some with the idea of giving force to a certain vague notion which they profess to have found in the ancient Fathers, especially the Greeks. The Popes, they assert, do not wish to pass judgment on what is a matter of dispute among theologians, so recourse must be had to the early sources, and the recent constitutions and decrees of the Teaching Church must be explained from the writings of the ancients.[4]

These words of the Holy Father bring up the interesting question of the relative value of the writings of the Church Fathers. What authority, for example, do the patristic writings enjoy when compared with Sacred Scripture, or with the decrees of the Popes and General Councils? What is the authority of one Church Father in relation to another, or of one Father who teaches a doctrine denied by many other Fathers? In a word, what position do the Church Fathers hold in the order of Divine Tradition?

---

[3] *Humani generis*, par. 20: "Quodsi Summi Pontifices in actis suis de re hactenus controversa data opera sententiam ferunt, omnibus patet rem illam, secundum mentem ac voluntatem eorumdem Pontificum quaestionem liberae inter theologos disceptationis iam haberi non posse."

[4] *Humani generis*, par. 18: "Quae in Romanorum Pontificum Encyclicis Litteris de indole et constitutione Ecclesiae exponuntur, a quibusdam consulto neglegi solent, ea quidem de causa ut praevaleat notio quaedam vaga, quam ex antiquis Patribus, praesertim graecis, haustam esse profitentur. Pontifices enim, ut ipsi dictitant, de his quae inter theologos disputantur iudicare nolunt, itaque ad pristinos fontes redeundum est et ex antiquorum scriptis recentiora Magisterii constitutiones ac decreta explicanda sunt."

The word *Traditio,* like the Latin *res* and *ratio,* is a term of multiple meaning, and consequently is often used vaguely in one or other of its various senses. In the terminology of theologians the word *Traditio* is used to indicate both whatever is delivered or transmitted, and the means by which it is transmitted. In the first sense, Tradition is the revealed word of God; in the second sense, it is the living Magisterium of the Church. Used in a very general way in the first sense, Tradition would include both the written and the unwritten word of God. Thus even Sacred Scripture, the written word of God, could be called a part of Divine Tradition. Theologians, however, distinguish between Sacred Scripture and Tradition, by restricting the meaning of Tradition in its objective sense to embrace only the unwritten word of God. Unwritten, however, in the sense that it was not written by the man to whom God revealed it, but was eventually put down in writing after it had been handed down orally for some time. There are, therefore, two sources of Divine Revelation, namely, Sacred Scripture and Tradition, with the Teaching Authority of the Church faithfully fulfilling the office of preserving, transmitting and interpreting both of them.

Those non-Catholics who accuse the Catholic Church of making accretions to revealed truth either fail to grasp or refuse to admit that the truth, revealed to His Church by Christ, was transmitted to succeeding generations both by written and unwritten traditions. Besides what was written (Sacred Scripture), there were many unwritten doctrines and customs (many of the "accretions" mentioned by the Protestants) communicated by Christ to His Apostles and by them transmitted orally to their successors, until finally they were put into writing.

These unwritten traditions eventually found expression both in the official documents of the Roman Pontiffs and the General Councils, and in the unofficial (for the most part) writings of the Church Fathers. It is true that not a few of the patristic writings may be considered official Church documents because they were composed by Fathers who were Roman Pontiffs, and, as such, held in their persons the sacred Teaching Office of the Church. Besides, many of the Fathers were bishops, and thereby shared, as a group, in the authority of the Teaching Church. Their writings, too, could have an official character, especially if they had been written for discussions in General Councils. The majority of the patristic writings, however, are considered unofficial documents.

By Tradition, then, is meant, first of all, the unwritten traditions handed down by Christ to His Church; traditions which found expression in the Papal and conciliar decrees, and in the writings of the Fathers. An essential and vital part of Tradition is the living magistracy of the Church functioning as the guardian and interpreter of the unwritten traditions. It is, of course, natural that both the official and the unofficial documents of Tradition contain also the written word of God, for in the writings of Tradition appeal is always made to the inspired word of God as contained in Sacred Scripture.

In speaking of the authority of the Fathers another clarification is needed. Just what writers are included under the term "Fathers of the Church"? Migne, in his *Patrologiae cursus completus,* the most comprehensive collection of patristic texts we have, included in the Latin series of Fathers the Latin writers from Tertullian to Pope Innocent III (+ 1216), and in his Greek series, the Fathers who wrote in Greek, from Pope Clement I to the Greek bishops of the Council of Florence (1439). Modern Patrologists, on the other hand, are much more strict in their use of the term "Father of the Church." They limit this title to those holy champions of the Christian faith who lived within the first eight centuries of our era, who defended and explained the deposit of faith with their orthodox writings, and who were approved, at least implicitly, by the Church. These men have left behind them a vast literature in Greek and Latin; a literature that not only contains unwritten traditions given by Christ to His Apostles, but also remains the foundation stone upon which Christian civilization was built from the ruins of the old pagan Graeco-Roman culture.

Now the Fathers of the Church, understood in the stricter sense of the phrase, have ever been held in high esteem by Christians down through the centuries. The *Summa* of St. Thomas, for instance, is literally studded with patristic quotations, and his *Catena aurea* is nothing more than a collection of patristic interpretations of the Gospels. Evidently the Scholastics attached great authority to the writings of the Fathers. But just how great is that authority?

When speaking of authority, as attributed to writers, we mean the moral power they have to elicit intellectual assent from their readers. This authority may be greater or less, or it may even be absolute, according to its power to produce in the mind of the reader a more or less probable agreement, or even a certain assent. The question now to be examined is whether the writings of the Fathers always produce certainty in the minds of the readers, or sometimes merely a state of probability.

Many non-Catholics attribute to the Church Fathers no greater authority than they do to other writers of early times. Their interest in the patristic writings is that of an antiquarian, who sees in these old documents no more than mere literary testimonials of an ancient age. Conversely, some Catholic theologians[5] have erred in the past by ascribing to the writings of the Fathers an authority equal to that of Sacred Scripture, while still others went to the Jansenistic extreme of preferring a single Father (St. Augustine) to the living Magisterium of the Church. It is precisely against this latter erroneous attitude that our Holy Father warns Catholic theologians when he says:

> What is expounded in the Encyclical Letters of the Roman Pontiffs concerning the nature and constitution of the Church, is deliberately and habitually neglected by some with the idea of giving force to a certain vague notion which they profess to have found in the ancient Fathers, especially the Greeks.[6]

To avoid such errors and to evaluate properly the authority that should be given to the writings of the Fathers, there are certain practical rules a theologian may follow.

First of all, one should remember that when the patristic writings deal solely with matters of *natural sciences* (e.g., history, philosophy, biology, etc.) the convincing power of the Fathers is in direct proportion to their argumentative powers. In other words, the authority of the Fathers is no greater than the reasons they give for their assertions, according to the dictum: *Tantum valent, quantum probant.*

On the other hand, when the Fathers treat of matters concerning *faith* or *morals*, the above-mentioned rule cannot be applied. In this case a distinction must be made between the more or less individual opinions of the Fathers and their unanimous agreement on a point of doctrine. The individual testimony of only one or a few of the Fathers is not sufficient in itself to produce certainty in the mind of the reader; it can and should produce a greater or less degree of probability according to the intellectual or ecclesiastical standing of the individual Father. The same must be said of the case where many Fathers give testimony on matters of faith or morals, while other Fathers hold a contrary or contradictory opinion. In all such cases the rules for the respective authority of individual Fathers, as will be given below, must be applied.

---

[5] E.g., Abbot Fredegis of the ninth century.

[6] *Humani generis,* par. 18, ut *supra* in note 4.

But when there is an agreement of the Fathers in matters of faith or morals, the well-known *consensus Patrum*, then their authority is greatest, and their testimony is enough to command intellectual assent and sufficient to produce a state of certainty in our minds.[7] This is so because, as a body in unanimous agreement, the Fathers bear witness to the teaching of the infallible Church. It should also be remembered that "so far as the Fathers of a certain period are all, or mostly, bishops, their consentient testimony in matters of faith or morals, is not only indirectly, but directly and in itself infallible, because they are the divinely appointed witnesses and the divinely instituted organ and channel of Tradition."[8] St. Augustine, the greatest of the Fathers, had this *consensus Patrum* in mind when he opposed the teaching of the earlier Fathers to that of Julianus, the Pelagian. By attacking the Fathers, he claimed, Julianus attacked the whole Church.[9]

In determining the *consensus* of the Fathers one cannot count heads and expect every single Father to be accounted for in the total summation of witnesses to a doctrine. Merely a moral agreement is sufficient, as for example, when the more illustrious Fathers expound a doctrine, and the other Fathers, for one reason or another, simply did not write about that specific doctrine, though they could have been aware of it. Their silence does not militate against the *consensus Patrum.*

---

[7] Cf. St. Vincent of Lerins, *Commonitorium*, 28: "Quae tamen antiqua sanctorum Patrum consensio, non in omnibus divinae Legis quaestiunculis, sed solum vel certe praecipue in Fidei Regula magno nobis studio et investiganda est, et sequenda."

[8] Schmid, *Manual of Patrology* (St. Louis: Herder, 1925), p. 35.

[9] *Contra Julianum Pelagianum*, II, 37: "Ubi tot sanctos doctores egregios atque memorabiles catholicae veritatis accuses, Irenaeum, Cyprianum, Reticium, Olympium, Hilarium, Gregorium, Basilium, Ambrosium, Joannem, Innocentium, Hieronymum, caeterosque socios ac participes eorum, insuper et universam Christi Ecclesiam."

While the *consensus Patrum* represents the mind of the Church in matters of faith and morals, it is particularly in the interpretation of Sacred Scripture that the authority of the *consensus* is most keenly felt. Popes and Councils have stated this fact most emphatically. St. Leo I, for instance, said: "It is not lawful to understand Scripture otherwise than the blessed Apostles and our Fathers have learned and taught."[10] The Council of Trent solemnly decreed:

> Let no one, trusting in his own wisdom, in matters appertaining to faith or morals, and the building up of Christian doctrine, dare, by twisting the Sacred Scripture to his own sense, to interpret them against the sense which our Holy Mother Church has held and holds, whose office it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of Holy Scriptures, *nor to interpret them against the unanimous consent of the Fathers.*[11]

The Vatican Council later repeated this Tridentine decree:

> In matters of faith or morals appertaining to the building up of Christian doctrine, that is to be held as the true sense of Scripture which Holy Mother Church has held and holds, whose office it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; and, therefore, *no one is allowed to interpret that same Sacred Scripture against this sense, or against the unanimous consent of the Fathers.*[12]

---

[10] Epistola 82, 1: "Et cum ab evangelica apostolicaque doctrina ne uno quidem verbo liceat dissidere, aut de Scripturis divinis sapere, quam beati Apostoli et Patres nostri didicerunt atque docuerunt."

[11] *Concilium Tridentinum,* Sess. IV, Decretum de Editione et Usu Sacrorum Librorum: "Praeterea, ad coercenda petulantia ingenia, decernit ut nemo, suae prudentiae innixus, in rebus fidei et morum, ad aedificationem doctrinae christianae pertinentium, sacram Scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens, contra eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta Mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum, aut etiam *contra unanimem consensum Patrum* ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari audeat."

[12] *Concilium Vaticanum,* Sess. III, c. 2, De Revelatione: "Nos, idem decretum (i.e., Tridentinum) renovantes, hanc illius mentem esse declaramus ut in rebus fidei et morum, ad aedificationem doctrinae christianae pertinen-

It should be noted that the binding authority of the Fathers, in their agreement on the interpretation of a Scriptural text, is limited to questions dealing with faith or morals.

So much for the *consensus Patrum*. Now what is to be said of the Fathers, considered individually and without reference to their unanimous agreement? Although the single Fathers (excepting those who were Roman Pontiffs), as individuals, were not infallible, and consequently their authority in matters of faith and morals is not in itself absolute, yet, in many instances, their authority is very great, and one would be rash to reject their opinions without just cause. This is particularly so if the Father presents the doctrine not merely as his own personal opinion, but as the general teaching of the whole Church. He very often does this by prefacing his words with such time-honored phrases as *Christus dixit, Apostoli tradiderunt, credimus* and *Ecclesia tenet*.

It goes without saying that the individual Fathers are not all of equal authority, for Holy Mother Church herself has honored some of them more than others, for instance, by conferring on some the added title of Doctor of the Church. To determine the various degrees of authority of the individual Fathers the following norms may be of some service:

(1) The greater the holiness and learning of the Father, the greater is his authority (e.g., Saints Basil, Ambrose, and John Chrysostom).[8]

(2) The nearer a Father lived to Apostolic times, the greater is his authority (e.g., Saints Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, and Polycarp of Smyrna).

(3) The greater the number of bishops with whom a Father came into contact, the higher is that Father's authority (e.g., Saints Irenaeus, Jerome, and Cyprian).

(4) Of very high authority are those Fathers who successfully

---

tium, is pro vero sensu sacrae Scripturae habendus sit, quem tenuit et tenet Sancta Mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum, atque ideo nemini licere contra hunc sensum, aut etiam contra *unanimem consensum Patrum ipsam Scripturam sanctam interpretari*."

defended and expertly expounded doctrines of the Church attacked by heretics (e.g., Saints Augustine, Athanasius, and Hilary); and those who were officially praised by the Church, or whose writings were publicly read and approved by the bishops in general council (e.g., Saints Augustine, Athanasius, and Leo I).

(5) Of the highest authority are those Fathers who were the bishops of Sees founded by the Apostles themselves (e.g., Saints Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, and Polycarp of Smyrna). Especially is this so of the Fathers who were the successors of Peter in the See of Rome, for to their *ex cathedra* utterances was attached the personal attribute of infallibility (e.g., Saints Leo I, Gregory I, and Damasus).

Because the authority of the individual Fathers varies, and because under the title of Church Fathers certain ecclesiastical writers are often quoted whose doctrine is sometimes far from reliable (e.g., Tertullian, Origen, and Eusebius of Caesarea), theologians should be cautious in their use of the Fathers.

On the other hand, Catholic theologians, by keeping in mind this admonition, have a ready answer for those opponents of the Church who, to disprove certain Catholic doctrines, seek out the writings of the lesser known Fathers (or even of unreliable ancient ecclesiastical writers) and quote as favoring their teaching vague and obscure passages from such patristic writings. St. Vincent of Lerins warned the Christians of fifteen centuries ago of this deceit when he complained of those who "often seize upon some of the more involved writings of an ancient author, which, merely because of their obscurity, seem to stand in agreement with the new dogma these men propose."[13] The obscure passage of all patristic writings are to be explained in accordance with the clear statements found in the writings of Fathers of high authority, especially in the writings of those Fathers who form part of the *consensus Patrum;* and more especially must they be interpreted in accordance with the official pronouncements of the Teaching Church.

To sum up this evaluation of the Fathers, may it be said that the writings of the Fathers, since they were not inspired, are not on the same level as the inspired Sacred Writings, but they are (when the *consensus Patrum* is had in matters of faith or morals) the surest guide for the proper interpretation of the Sacred Text. In their relationship to the living magistracy of the Church, the Fathers, in unanimous agreement, reflect the mind of the Church, but, as individuals, they are subject to the Teaching Authority. The Church has always shown a great respect for the Fathers, but, as someone has expressed it, "she judges them more than she is judged by them." It is precisely this truth that the Holy Father wishes to emphasize when, in the *Humani generis,* he warns theologians against setting up obscure statements from ancient patristic writings in opposition to the authoritative words of the Papal Encyclicals.

---

[13] *Commonitorium,* 7: "Captant plerumque veteris cujuspiam viri scripta paulo involutius edita, quae pro ipsa sui obscuritate dogmati suo quasi congruant."

THOMAS B. FALLS

St. Charles Seminary
Overbrook, Philadelphia, Pa.

DETACHMENT

Detachment, as we know from spiritual books, is a rare and high Christian virtue; a great Saint, St. Philip Neri, said that, if he had a dozen really detached men, he should be able to convert the world. To be detached is to be loosened from every tie which binds the soul to the earth, to be dependent on nothing sublunary, to lean on nothing temporal; it is to care simply nothing what other men choose to think or say of us, or do to us; to go about our own work, because it is our duty, as soldiers go to battle, without a care for the consequences; to account credit, honour, name, easy circumstances, comfort, human affections, just nothing at all, when any religious obligation involves the sacrifice of them. It is to be as reckless of all these goods of life on such occasions, as under ordinary circumstances we are lavish and wanton, if I must take an example, in our use of water,—or as we make a present of our words without grudging to friend or stranger,—or as we may get rid of wasps or flies or gnats, which trouble us, without any sort of compunction, without hesitation before the act, and without a second thought after it.

—John Henry Cardinal Newman, in Vol. III of the *Historical Sketches* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1903), p. 130.

THE PURPOSE OF THE MISSIONS

"You go to the missions for only one reason—to make sure of your own salvation." Thus a distinguished foreign missionary used to dismiss theoretical discussions on the missionary purpose.

His solution, though appealingly simple, evaded the issue. Why are the missions a work that contributes to the worker's salvation and sanctification? What is their rank among the many salutary works? What guiding purpose do they require a man to follow, when he seeks to save and sanctify himself by serving them? What is their *finis operis?*

It is doubtless a sign of seriousness in the missionary spirit of our time and a promise of firmly rooted, far-branching zeal in the future, that considerable theological discussion has taken place in the last twenty years on the fundamental reasons for missions. One view that has already won many adherents is that of Fr. Pierre Charles, S.J., distinguished writer on spiritual and missionary subjects, founder of the *Semaine Missiologique* of Louvain and Professor of Missiology in the Gregorian University, Rome. In writing and in speech, Fr. Charles has presented this view with clarity and persuasiveness. He has won talented disciples who have helped to spread his teaching. I have before me the tangible evidence that it has been stated, more or less completely, in book, clerical review, magazine, pamphlet, and lecture in Belgium, France, the United States, Canada, England, and Spain during the past seventeen years. Quite recently Fr. Edward L. Murphy, S.J., has stated it, to some extent, in his vibrant, vigorous booklet, *Beachheads Won for Christ.*[1]

It is time to examine this view critically. Obviously, if it is propagated still more, it will soon color the outlook of priests and people at home and it will influence the conduct of missions abroad. If it is entirely sound, this result is to be welcomed and even hastened. But if the theory is not fully supported by authoritative missionary texts and authentic missionary tradition, it should not be popularized and the specialists would do well to modify it.

In this article I take up the view as set forth by Fr. Charles himself in his *Dossiers de l'action missionnaire,* nos. 36, 37 and 38.[2]

---

[1] New York: Jesuit Philippine Bureau, 1943.

[2] Louvain, 1926. (Translations and summary are mine.)

First, he states the "problem." The missions are a fact written large across the map of the world. This fact has an idea behind it "It is from conviction and to obtain something, some religious result, that Catholics work at the conversion of the pagan world. To define this idea . . . is the first task of missionary theology."

Fr. Charles then considers and rejects three solutions that might be advanced. One, which need not detain us, would explain missionary activity as the inevitable, almost instinctive, consequence of any religious conviction. This would be seeking in psychology a reason that should be found in theology. Fr. Charles disposes of the opinion, pointing to non-Christian cults that have produced no missions or only intermittent, defective evangelistic attempts.

He then reviews the following solution: "Missionary activity is an act of obedience to the last command of Christ," to go to preach the Gospel to all nations (cf. *Matt.* 28:19, *Mark* 16:15). Fr. Charles finds this inacceptable. He says:

(1) This command does indeed give *a* sufficient motive, "though one may ask if it is not the exclusive concern of the apostles and their successors."

(2) The command is not arbitrary. The reasons that inspire it are what we seek.

(3) The generous, spontaneous and joyous service given to the missionary cause cannot well be explained by mere obedience to a precept. Such obedience is not accompanied by enthusiasm.

(4) If this command alone explains the missions, then the only task of the missionary is to teach, baptize and train in Christian conduct the greatest possible numbers of people over wide areas. This would place outside the apostolate such activities as higher education, technical schools, social works. But experience proves that on oral teaching alone, given thus, it is hardly possible to found enduring Christian communities.

(5) According to this solution, the only real missionaries would be those who preach and baptize. Hence Sisters and lay Brothers would not rank as missionaries.

Fr. Charles then considers another solution, which he states thus: "Missionary activity is an act of charity. Its primary aim is to save souls. It is directed first of all towards our neighbor in need. Without apostolic aid, pagans would be lost forever. The missionary goes to their aid as the doctor goes to the aid of the sick or as the life-saver rescues the drowning." Fr. Charles rejects this familiar view for the following reasons:

(1) If missionary activity is justified by the desire, the need or the duty of saving souls, it is not necessary, it is even unreasonable to go looking for them at the ends of the earth. In every Christian country, in our industrial cities, in our universities, there are thousands of souls in mortal spiritual danger, and they are much easier to reach than the pagans of Asia or Africa.

(2) This view would make the diocesan clergy of Christian lands as truly missionaries as the priests who have gone overseas to non-Christian peoples. All rank as savers of souls. Indeed, a priest in a parish at home may actually save many more than his colleague abroad.

This view would compel us to condemn "the more profound but slower" missionary methods in favor of those that give immediate soul-saving returns. For instance, the seventeenth-century Jesuits, exercising their scientific and artistic abilities in the imperial court of Pekin, would be proved wrong. They should have been out baptizing dying infants. Similarly Catholic universities in mission lands today would be of little value compared with the harvests of souls to be easily gathered in hospitals and similar institutions.

(4) The missionary who was getting "almost no" converts would be not only justified but almost bound to seek a less barren field or even to go back home.

(5) If the missionary is only a soul-saver, his task is limitless and will be never done. It will continue until the last day. There will always be souls to save. The prospect of such a prolonged campaign cannot elicit intensive effort. It is discouraging to the faithful.

(6) Finally, this view is likely to cause strained relations between the evangelizer and the evangelized. The missionary, as a "saviour," will feel that the pagan is indebted to him and owes him gratitude and docility. The pagan, especially if he is highly civilized and unconscious of any spiritual poverty, will not relish this emphasis on his inferiority and his dependence on a foreigner whom he despises.

THE THEORY OF FR. CHARLES

Having thus rejected other theories, Fr. Charles now presents what he regards as "the true solution." Pointing out that no canonical, ethnological, devotional or geographical rule exists by which a region can be identified as a mission field, he applies the following test: if the Church does not exist, visibly and completely established, "with its hierarchy, the permanence of the means of salvation, the sacraments morally accessible to all," in a country or within an "ethnic group," then that country or group is a mission territory.

As a consequence of this definition, he states that the purpose of the missions is to establish the visible Church. Missionary activity is not primarily or solely an act of obedience or an act of charity to our neighbor in his need. "It is all that, because it is first of all and essentially an act of religion, to be done by the Church and for the Church."

The Church is visible in a country, he explains, when it has the stability proper to it as a permanent institution for the salvation of mankind, when it is complete with the educational and social works that produce a favorable environment for its doctrinal and sacramental action, when it has been built up with its necessary material equipment. This stage has been reached, when the saving doctrines of Christ and the sacraments are permanently available to the whole population.

Elaborating the consequences of this theory, he renews his argument against the views he has already rejected. He says (I paraphrase and condense):

(1) The last command of Christ to preach the Gospel to all nations did not create but confirmed the obligation of the Catholic to work for the plenitude of the Church of which he is a member.

(2) If missionary activity were primarily an act of charity towards unfortunate pagans, it would be entirely on a basis of compassion, of pity, which would antagonize people who were a little proud. But if the missionary's primary objective is to build up the Church, his is not essentially a work of pity. He does not tell the pagan that they are obliged, but he invites them, to enter the Church, "which is no more ours than theirs."

(3) This view gives an effective answer to the objection: "There

are plenty of souls to save at home." The answer is: "The missionary does not seek primarily to save souls but to establish the means of salvation. The means are available at home; they are still to be made available in mission lands."

(4) Thus the missionary task does not seem interminable. It can be presented as something urgent, more urgent than work in Christian lands, and also as capable of completion.

(5) This solution places the native priest in mission lands among the ranks of the missionaries as truly as the priest who has come from overseas.

(6) The missionary obligation arises from baptism, binding every Catholic. All the members of the body are bound to contribute to the growth of the body.

(7) This view gives a guiding line for missionary method, proving the wisdom of men like Fr. Ricci, making his scientific approach to the imperial authorities of China. "If it were merely a matter of saving souls in the shortest time possible, the strategy of Father Ricci and his successors would be unsound. But if the missionary's duty is to construct the established means of salvation, this slow procedure is only the wisdom of the bricklayer."

In closing this summary of Fr. Charles' little treatises on *La raison d'être des missions*, I must remind the reader that the *Dossiers de l'action missionnaire* are not scientific theological publications. Consequently the treatment of the subject does not have quite the form or depth that it doubtless would, if the learned writer were lecturing to theological students or writing in a theological review. His thesis is, however, sufficiently clear for serious debate. Indeed, the statement of his case in the *Dossiers* seems to have been taken even by specialists as adequate, for distinct echoes of it can be discerned in the writings of several of his missiological followers.

CRITICISM OF SOME OF HIS ARGUMENTS

All the reasoning in this discussion by Fr. Charles does not seem to be of equal quality. At times it is a little swift and tenuous.

He suggests a doubt whether the command to go into the whole world and preach the Gospel is not the exclusive concern of the Apostles and their successors, the Pope and the bishops. True, it was given directly to the Apostles; the authority and the prerogatives that it bestows belong to their successors. It would be a harmful error to say that it is a divine commission given to every Catholic. But implicitly it concerns the general body of Catholics, because it binds them to co-operate with the Supreme Pontiff and the episcopate as far as may be necessary and possible. "The Pastors of the Church," says Cardinal Gasparri in his *Catechismus catholicus*,[3] "have the right and the duty of preaching the Gospel to every creature, and it is the duty of good children of the Church to assist them in this holy and salutary task." Fr. Charles seems to suggest later that the last command of Christ does not have a bearing on the general missionary obligation that affects every Catholic.

The objection from the enthusiasm of missionary workers does not seem to have much weight. "If you love me, keep my commandments," says Our Lord,[4] and what is more enthusiastic than love?

Fr. Charles objects that since Christ's last precept includes only preaching and baptizing, then educational and social welfare work would fall outside the missionary category, if we saw the purpose of the missions in the fulfillment of this command. In this he is surely wrong. All Catholic education, from the primary grade to the university, belongs to the general mission of teaching given to the Apostles and their successors. Pope Pius XI says: "Education belongs pre-eminently to the Church by reason of a double title. . . . The first title is founded upon the express mission and supreme authority to teach, given to her by her divine Founder: 'All power is given to Me in heaven and earth. Going therefore, teach ye all nations,' etc. . . . Christian education takes in the whole aggregate of human life, physical and spiritual, intellectual and moral, individual, domestic and social."[5]

THE MAIN FLAW

The great defect in Fr. Charles' thesis is his rejection of the idea that "missionary activity is [primarily] an act of charity of which the primary aim is to save souls." To deny that this idea expresses the dominant purpose of the missions seems to me to be departing from the constant trend of the Holy See, from the trend of the liturgy and other approved Catholic prayer, and from the tradition formed and represented by missionary saints and leaders.

---

[3] Fourth ed., p. 131, n. 3.

[4] *John* 14:15.

[5] Encyclical *On the Christian Education of Youth* (NCWC text), pp. 6, 7, 36.

In the space to which an article like this is restricted, I can give only a selection of quotations to sustain my criticism.

The first group of quotations are from official statements of the Holy See. They express, it seems to me, the primary purpose of the missions as the salvation of souls, and some of them specify as well that the missions are primarily a work of charity. They do not often use the word "primary," but they show no consciousness of any other *finis operis* to which the salvation of souls would be secondary. (It is understood, of course, by all that the ultimate purpose of the missions and every other work is the glory of God.)

STATEMENTS OF THE HOLY SEE

Who does not realize that all our anxieties and all our efforts press for the advance of the work of bringing souls to the Church of Christ? Since God so valued the salvation of the world as to give His Only-Begotten Son . . . so that the Lord, in His excessive charity, might redeem his servants—yes, His evil servants—by the price of His Blood, all who faithfully glory in the Christian name should be imitators of that inestimable charity. (Gregory XV, in the Bull *Inscrutabili*, erecting the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, June 22, 1622.)[6]

Since we were given an entry into the empire of Tonkin, we have as our one aim to advance the greater glory of God and the conversion of the unbelievers. (Clement X, in the Brief *Apostolatus Officium*, Dec. 23, 1673.)[7]

Indeed, if, according to Jesus Christ Himself, whoever gives a drink of cold water to one of His least will not lose his reward, most liberal will be the reward awaiting him who by contributing even a little material aid to the missions and adding the assistance of his prayers, at one and the same time performs many and various acts of charity and becomes a helper of God for the salvation of his fellow-man—which the

---

[6] *Collectanea S. Congregationis de Prop. Fide*, I, 3. (Translations and italics are mine in these quotations.)

[7] Quoted by Vromant, *Jus missionariorum* (Louvain, 1933; reprinted in part in *Apostolicum*, Tsinan, China, July-October, 1934).

Fathers have called the most divine of all divine works. (Leo XIII in the Encyclical, *Sancta Dei civitas,* Dec. 3, 1880.)[8]

But since the conversion of the pagans to Christ Our Lord . . . is the principal end of the missions, the Vicars Apostolic should strive whole-heartedly for that objective. (Instruction of the Sacred Congregation to the Vicars of China, Oct. 18, 1883.)[9]

[This ever greater effort] is demanded from them [the Bishops of India] first, by their divine vocation, in virtue of which they are ennobled by the title of heralds of the Gospel. It is demanded of them by the most pitiful condition of so many souls who . . . wander unhappily far from the path of eternal salvation. Finally it is asked of them by this Sacred Congregation, whose special duty it is to concentrate on the conversion of the nations. (Letter from the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda to the Bishops of India, Aug. 28, 1893.)[10]

Full of pity for the woeful condition of such a vast multitude of [pagan] souls, we have no dearer wish than to extend to them the blessings of divine Redemption. . . . The first care of the head of a mission is to advance the work and crown it with completion . . . he must strive for the eternal salvation of all the people who live in the region. . . . The head of a Catholic mission, who has nothing at heart but the glory of God and the salvation of souls, seeks helpers on all sides to aid him, if need be, in his most holy task, and he does not care whether they belong to his own or another community or nationality, provided only that in every way Christ is being proclaimed.

The faithful should first of all realize how sacred a law binds them to help the missions to the unbelievers. For God "gave to every one of them commandment concerning his neighbor" (*Ecclus.* 17:12)—and this commandment is more gravely urgent according as a greater need afflicts our neighbor. Now what group of men are in more dire need of brotherly aid than the unbelievers who, since they know not God, are held in the grip of blind and unbridled passions and labor under the worst of all slaveries, slavery to the devil? . . .

Finally material resources . . . are required to keep up the missions. . . . Here we appeal to all the faithful to be liberal according to their means. For "he who has the goods of this world and sees his brother in need and closes his heart to him, how does the love of God abide in him?" (*I John* 3:17). Thus speaks John the Apostle about those who suffer from material want. How much more religiously is the law of charity to be observed in this case, where it is a question not only of relieving the needs and destitution and other miseries of an innumerable multitude but also—and primarily—of delivering such a mighty host of souls from the proud domination of Satan and bringing them to the liberty of the children of God. . . . How strongly the fire of fatherly charity drives us to bring the countless multitude of men into the Lord's embrace! (Benedict XV in the Encyclical, *Maximum illud*, Nov. 30, 1919.)[11]

---

[8] *Collectanea S. Cong. de P. F.*, II, 142.
[9] *Ibid.*, II, 192.
[10] *Ibid.*, II, 296.

The apostolic missionary should set no other purpose before him . . . than the conversion of men to God and the salvation of souls. (Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, Jan. 6, 1920.)[12]

But how many are the souls that are still being lost. . . . May the world hear our call and may all come to the aid of the souls whom Christ has redeemed and who are still being lost in error and barbarism! . . . That even one soul be lost through our tardiness, through our lack of generosity . . . this is a serious responsibility on which we have reflected perhaps not over frequently in the course of our lives. (Sermon of Pope Pius XI on the Tercentenary of Propaganda, Pentecost, 1922.)[13]

That those who belong to the fold of Christ should care nothing about those others who, in their misery, wander without, is totally repugnant to that charity which ought to embrace God and all men. . . . Can we show forth charity towards our neighbors in any greater or more signal manner than by seeing that they are led out from the darkness of superstition and instructed in the true Faith of Christ? This surpasses other works and manifestations of charity as the soul surpasses the body, as heaven surpasses earth, as eternity surpasses time. . . . Venerable Brethren, you must not be ashamed or reluctant to become, as it were, beggars for Christ and the salvation of souls. (Pius XI in the Encyclical, *Rerum ecclesiae*, Feb. 28, 1926.)[14]

THE *LEX ORANDI*

In the text of the votive Mass for the Propagation of the Faith we see how the liturgy expresses the purpose of the missions. This votive Mass was approved in 1787 for all missionaries in all missions. In 1841 it was extended to all dioceses in which the Society for the Propagation of the Faith was established. (The present wording of the prayers is from 1842.) Therefore from the beginning it has been a Mass expressly for the missions.

---

[11] *Sylloge* (Vatican Press, 1939), pp. 113-128.

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 131 f.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 196-202.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 240.

The Collect reads:

> O God Who dost wish all men to be saved and to come to knowledge of the truth, send forth, we beseech Thee, laborers into Thy harvest and grant that they may speak Thy word with all boldness, so that Thy word may run and be glorified and that all nations may know Thee, the only true God, and Him Whom Thou hast sent, Jesus Christ Thy Son, Our Lord, Who lives and reigns. . . .

The Lesson is from Ecclesiasticus and calls for the submission of pagans to God's dominion; it does not refer explicitly to the salvation of souls. The Gospel is Matt. 9:35-38. It expresses the outlook of the divine Missionary: "Seeing the crowds, he was moved with compassion for them, because they were bewildered and dejected, like sheep without a shepherd." Then come His statement and His conclusion: "He said to his disciples The harvest indeed is abundant but the laborers are few. Pray therefore the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into his harvest."

The other parts of the Mass refer more generally to the extension of God's reign over men. The alternative Epistle printed at the end of the Mass is specific. It is I Tim. 2:1-7, emphasizing God's will that all men be saved.

THE MISSIONS IN APPROVED PRAYERS

Prayers approved by the Holy See for non-liturgical use also express the authentic spirit of the missions. In the collection *Preces et pia opera*, published by the Vatican Press for the Sacred Paenitentiaria in 1937, we find a section entitled *Pro missionibus inter infideles*.[15] The first prayer under this heading is that of St. Francis Xavier for the salvation of the unbelievers. It begins: "Eternal God, Creator of all things, remember that Thou has created the souls of the infidels. . . ." Of the nine prayers in this section four ask expressly for the salvation of souls; four are primarily for the missionaries; one asks that God be glorified by all nations and that the Mass be offered in every place (this prayer is actually the Secret of the votive Mass for the missions).

---

[15] Pp. 563 ff.

The testimony of missionary saints and leaders is obviously of great importance in relation to any theory on the *raison d'être* of the missions. Within my necessary limitation of space I will quote only two saints, those whom the Holy See has declared patrons of all missions, St. Francis Xavier and St. Thérèse.

ST. FRANCIS XAVIER'S MISSIONARY PURPOSE

> I looked for nothing here but to wear myself out with work and sacrifice my life itself in bringing about the salvation of souls in those regions of India. (Letter to John III, King of Portugal.)[16]

> We shall invite all the pious religious orders . . . to come out at once and slake that heavenly thirst for souls which they feel, in these islands of Japan as well as in the country of China. (Letter to the Society at Goa.)[17]

> You, too, will do well to come yourself to China, to slake your thirst for the salvation of souls. (Letter to Fr. Simón Rodriguez.)[18]

> It often comes into my mind to go around all the universities of Europe, and especially that of Paris, crying out everywhere like a madman and saying to all the learned men there whose learning is so much greater than their charity: "Ah, what a multitude of souls is through your fault shut out of heaven and falling into hell! . . . I had almost made up my mind to write to the University of Paris . . . and to show them how many thousands of infidels might be made Christians without trouble, if we had men here who would seek not their own advantage but the things of Jesus Christ. (Letter to the Society at Rome.)[19]

ST. THÉRÈSE

The convictions of St. Thérèse on the purpose of the missions are reflected in her letters to the two priests of the Paris Foreign Missions whose spiritual sister she became, giving them the aid of her prayers and sacrifices. To one who was still a seminarian she wrote: "It is His wish you should begin your mission even now, and save souls through the Cross. . . . Let us work together for the salvation of souls!"[20]

---

[16] Coleridge, *Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier* (4th ed., London, 1912), II, 7.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 258.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 492.

[19] *Ibid.*, I, 155.

[20] *St. Thérèse of Lisieux, An Autobiography* (New York, 1927), p. 369.

A MISSIONARY CLASSIC

The writer whose work seems to have led to the actual foundation of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide in 1622 deserves to be quoted. This is the Discalced Carmelite, Fr. Thomas of Jesus. In 1610 he published in Rome his book *Stimulus missionum,* as a sort of introduction to his great, historic, fruitful work, *De procuranda salute omnium gentium,* published in Antwerp in 1613. In this work[21] he recommended the foundation of a special commission or congregation in Rome to direct and promote the missions. Nine years later the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda was founded. In 1624 Propaganda ordered eighty copies to give to missionaries and in 1632 wrote to the Carmelite Superiors recommending that a new edition of such a useful book be published.[22]

The very title of the book is significant. It emphasizes at once the note of the salvation of souls. The first note struck is the dire spiritual necessity of the non-Christian peoples. "In this first part, as we survey the face of the whole world, we find that the extreme necessity of souls is revealed."[23]

Then, after a brief survey of the spiritual needs in the various parts of the world, the author says: "After studying this short description of the world, a description that ought to soften a heart of stone, who will be so pitiless as to watch mankind perishing without coming to its rescue, when he can render aid?" He tells how the sight of "this universal and incredible need of salvation" drove Xavier to write the letter already quoted, in which he longs to go around the universities of Europe, crying out how many souls could be saved if men had as much charity as learning.

He devotes his fourth chapter to two points: the insistent teaching of Christ that we exercise charity to our neighbor, and the example of charity that Christ gave us. "Christ the Lord was not content with merely giving us the general precept, lest perhaps we Christians . . . might think that this charity should be shown only within the limits of the Church, but He enjoined the Church most strongly to care for the infidels. Other sheep I have, . . ." The author drives home the fact that the work of the missions is a necessary work of Christlike charity.[24]

---

[21] Libri I-IV (Rome, 1940).

[22] P. XI of the Preface by P. Thomas A Jesu Pammolli, editor of the latest edition.

[23] *De procuranda salute omnium gentium,* pp. 9 ff.

CONCLUSION FROM THE EVIDENCE

All this evidence, it seems to me, leads to this conclusion: In the mind of the Holy See and in Catholic tradition, the primary purpose of the missions is to save souls and mission activity is primarily a work of sublime charity.

What of the objections that Fr. Charles raises against this view of the missions?

ANSWERS TO OBJECTIONS

The objection that it can antagonize sensitive pagans is not a refutation. Moreover, no one can ever be converted, under any mission theory, unless he reaches the point of acknowledging his spiritual poverty and his utter need of the Church. In the early stages, when the Faith is first presented to him, he may indeed be repelled by condemnation of his traditional religion or by an attitude of condescension. But it is an essential part of the charity that inspires the missions, to have humility and tact in dealing with all men and to begin not so much by emphasizing the difference between the pagan and the Christian as by dwelling on the good traits or customs that they may have in common.

In reply to another objection of Fr. Charles, I cannot agree that the "slower methods" of higher education, social works, or of Fr. Ricci's strategy are ruled out by a primary purpose of saving souls. Papal documents and missionary practice point to these means as most useful and sometimes indispensable for the saving of souls. Fr. Charles strains the opinion that he rejects, when he changes the phrase from "saving souls" to "saving souls *in the shortest time possible*."[25] The missionary whose prime purpose is the salvation of souls is not thereby committed to a helter-skelter policy. He knows well that there is a great deal of ground to be cleared before baptism and a great deal to be covered after baptism, and his task is to help in every stage. Similarly, I feel that Fr. Murphy, S.J., arguing for a modified form of Fr. Charles' theory, does not express the salvation-of-souls view adequately when he implies that it restricts the missionary to "the specific work of convert-making."[26]

---

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

[25] *Dossiers*, no. 38, p. 4.

"SOULS TO SAVE AT HOME"

More serious, at first sight, is the objection stated by Fr. Charles when he says in effect: "If the missionary's primary purpose is to save souls, he can save them—perhaps many more of them—at home, where thousands are in urgent need of being saved." If I may quote what I have written elsewhere on this subject, I reply:

> A man's soul is not any more precious in itself just because he happens to live five thousand miles away from us, uses chopsticks and speaks a language utterly strange to our ears. An immortal soul is as valuable on Fifth Avenue or LaSalle Street as in the bazaars of Calcutta or the rice-fields of Kiangsi. No lover of Christ will make little of any need of any soul anywhere.
>
> But while souls in one place are as truly dear to their Creator and Redeemer as souls in another, work for souls in one place may be a greater service to God than work for souls elsewhere.
>
> The lost sheep was only a sheep. We are not told that it had a golden fleece, either. It was the same kind of animal as the ninety-nine that were left in the desert. Yet the shepherd rejoiced more over regaining the lost sheep than over the relative safety of the rest of the flock. The farther the wanderer has strayed, the greater will be the anxiety of the shepherd, the more painstaking his search and the deeper his joy at the happy finding.
>
> And those who love the shepherd know that they do him the greatest kindness when they bring home to him the sheep that has been lost in the most perilous regions, in the wilds where the fold is utterly out of sight and where only the faintest notes of the shepherd's horn can be heard.
>
> The soul that strays in the homeland is always in sight of the Church. It has at least some knowledge of Christ. It has the aid of many external Christian influences.
>
> A soul in paganism is the most forlorn of all lost sheep.[27]

The same reply covers the objection based on the "almost fruitless" missions. No mission field is completely and permanently sterile.[28] The "almost fruitless" yields some fruit and will yield more. That fruit, because of the surrounding barrenness, is incalculably precious. Furthermore, it is not on the apparent fruits but on the apparent need that every priest, at home and abroad, must base his choice of work. God gives the increase. No one else can give or guarantee it.

---

[26] *Beachheads Won for Christ*, p. 17.

[27] Editorial in *The Far East* (St. Columban's Foreign Mission Society, St. Columbans, Nebr.), April, 1933, p. 13.

"MORE RESULTS AT HOME"

Further, we must beware of thinking that the person who actually pours the water of baptism or says the words of absolution is the person who has saved the sinner's soul. Rarely does one agent anywhere do the whole task—as far as is given to human agents—of saving any soul. In that tremendous deed many a Christian has a working hand and a praying voice and a loving heart. In the homelands, as contrasted with mission lands, there are more people —priests, religious and laity—to contribute to the final effect; and I include the past generations, who by praying and sacrificing, by forming traditions and bequeathing knowledge, have helped to save the souls of those who come after them. Consequently each one's share in the salvation of the imperilled soul is, ordinarily, less in the home countries than it is when a soul is saved in non-Christian lands. Where the workers are fewer, the need for each, the effort of each and the reward of each are all greater.

What is more important still, the missionary has his reaping-hook in the harvests of the future as well as of the present. He brings the infusion of the life of Christ for the first time into the blood-streams of families that have been pagan from time immemorial. More than any individual worker can, in the lands already Christianized, the missionary wields his salutary influence over generations of which his converts of today will be the ancestors.

For all these reasons, the primary purpose of saving souls endows the missions with a claim on our charity and zeal more insistent than any other part of God's vineyard will—normally—have.

THE CHURCH MUST BE ESTABLISHED

Here is where the missionary theory that I am supporting approaches that of Fr. Charles. The salvation of souls is the purpose of the missions. The salvation of souls is the purpose of the Church. The missionary saves souls effectively only through the Church.[29] The way to convert pagans is to bring the Church to them. The way to save the greatest number of souls most securely is to leave the Church firmly established with them and their children. It is precisely because the missions are primarily for the salvation of souls that they must strive to establish the Church "of native elements" in mission lands.

---

[28] Bishop Turquetil, O.M.I., spent from 1912 to 1916 in his lonely Eskimo mission in Chesterfield, on Hudson's Bay, without making one convert. Thanks to the aid of St. Thérèse, he had his first baptisms—of four families—on July 2, 1917. Remarkable progress ensued (cf. *Thawing Out the Eskimo*, by Morice-Laughlin [Boston: Propagation of the Faith Society, 1943]).

Nothing is done by the Church that is not for the salvation of souls. The Church is not rightly portrayed if it is shown as in any way, or at any time, or in any activity, cultural, social or disciplinary, opposed to or in competition with the salvation of souls. I do not say the salvation of some souls in the shortest possible time; I do not say the break-neck making of new converts. I say the salvation of the greatest number of souls before time ceases: that is the *raison d'être* of the Church and of the missions. It is a mistake to try to distinguish between them.

In 1933 two Spanish Capuchins published a *Manual de misionología*, a veritable one-volume encyclopedia of the missions. Early in the book they make a statement that tries to blend the theory of Fr. Charles with what I hold is the traditional one. "The end of missionary activity is twofold: the generic . . . the salvation of souls, the specific, to plant and establish the Church of Jesus Christ."[30]

In *Il pensiero missionario*, organ of the Missionary Union of the Clergy in Italy, the book was reviewed by U.B.—presumably Dr.

---

[29] Supporters of Fr. Charles' theory have leaned heavily on the first sentence of the following quotation from the Encyclical *Rerum ecclesiae* of Pius XI: "Quorsum, quaesumus, sacrae missiones pertinent nisi ut in tanta immensitate locorum Ecclesia Christi instituatur ac stabiliatur? Et unde haec apud ethnicos hodie constabit nisi ex omnibus iis elementis ex quibus apud nos olim coaluit, id est, ex suo cuiusque regionis et populo et clero suisque religiosis viris et feminis?" It should be remembered that this text is part of a long document that elsewhere describes the missions as a pre-eminent work of charity for the salvation of souls. Furthermore, one is not warranted in taking the "Quorsum . . . pertinent . . ." as a definition of the *finis* of the missions. The Pontiff wrote *quorsum*, "in what direction"—not *ad quem finem*. He was emphasizing the mode, the *via*, by which the missions are to accomplish their end of saving souls.

[30] P. 22.

Ugo Bertini, the editor. The review is well worth quoting:

> We agree that the purpose of the missions is to found and to establish the Church, the ordinary and stable means, willed by Jesus Christ, for the salvation of souls. But let us be on our guard against introducing distinctions which, perhaps, do not correspond to reality. Above all, let us not give the impression of dividing the purpose of the apostolate, placing in a subordinate position that which is the ultimate purpose; salvation in Christ by visibly belonging to His Mystical Body. Hence if one really wants to admit a distinction of purposes, in place of the *generic* (to save souls) and the *specific* (to found the Church), one may say more appropriately the *mediate* and the *immediate*. But we hasten to add that these purposes ought not to be separated and that, fundamentally, they are one.
>
> This observation we have wished to make at once, to put the reader on his guard against too facile subtleties which, especially where one treats of a new science still in process of formation, could affect the general understanding of the missionary objective, not only in its essence, which would be serious enough, but also in its practical application.[31]

THE MISSIONS, A WORK OF CHARITY

By ranking as a work of charity, the missions do not suffer in prestige nor do they lose their claim to the obligatory aid of every Catholic. Charity is the queen of virtues and it is the great commandment. The Church is a work of charity, because it is the extension and application of the Redemption, God's work of infinite charity. The Church is missionary because the Church is the charity of Christ in action. According to St. Paul, it is in charity that the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, builds itself up, that is, grows.[32] Prat suggests that the growth of which the Apostle speaks here is intensive rather than extensive.[33] But it seems reasonable to regard the growth of the Mystical Body as one process, the exterior (addition of new members within the bond of charity) being commensurate with the interior (the increase of charity in the existing members). The Holy Spirit, living principle of the Mystical Body, pours charity into the hearts of Christ's members.

---

[31] *Il pensiero missionario* (Union Missionaria de Clero in Italia, Rome), V, 3 (Sept. 30, 1933), 320.

[32] *Eph.* 4:16.

[33] *The Theology of St. Paul* (3rd ed., London, 1938), II, 306.

By the exercise of that charity in missions, the members extend the life of Christ to their fellow-men, incorporating new members into His Body, which thus grows towards "the mature measure of the fullness of Christ."[34]

Accordingly I submit that the primary purpose of the missions is the salvation of souls and that the missions are primarily a work of highest charity. The true missionary spirit, flowering in apostolic vocations and in apostolic generosity, will not be inspired by other theories.

PATRICK O'CONNOR

St. Columban's
Tokyo, Japan

---

[34] *Eph.* 4:13.

POPE PIUS XII ON THE DIVINE OFFICE

Moreover, the Divine Office is a most efficacious means of sanctification. Certainly it is not a mere recitation of formularies or of artistically executed chants; it is not just a question of respect for certain norms, called rubrics, or for external ceremonies of worship; it is above all a matter of elevating the mind and heart to God, in unison with the blessed spirits, who eternally sing praises to God. . . .

Consequently, the priest ought to pray with the same intention as the Redeemer. So that his voice is, as it were, the voice of the Lord who, by means of the priest, continues to implore from the most merciful Father the benefits of the Redemption; it is the very voice of the Lord with which are associated the armies of the angels and saints in heaven and of all the faithful on earth, to render due glory to God; it is the voice of Christ our Advocate, by which we receive the immense treasure of His merits.

Meditate with care and attention on these fertile truths which the Holy Spirit has disclosed to us in the Sacred Scriptures and upon which the writings of the Fathers and Doctors are commentary explanations. As your lips repeat the words dictated by the Holy Spirit, try not to lose anything of this great treasure, and, that your soul may be responsive to the voice of God, put away from your minds with all effort and zeal whatever might distract you and recollect your thoughts, that you may thus more easily and with greater fruit attend to the contemplation of the eternal truths.

—In the *Menti nostrae*, Sept. 23, 1950 (NCWC translation, pp. 16 f.).

THE MEANING OF THE CHURCH'S NECESSITY FOR SALVATION

PART III

What is by far the most acceptable presentation of our thesis in the manuals of sacred theology is the one which describes the Church as necessary for salvation with the necessity of means, in such a way that a man must belong to the Church *in re* (as a member) or *in voto* (as one who intends to become a member) in order to achieve eternal salvation. The literature of scholastic theology designates a thing as necessary with the necessity of means when a given effect cannot be obtained apart from it. Thus the necessity of means is distinct from a mere necessity of precept, the necessity attaching to a thing precisely and only because it is commanded. The wilful rejection of a reality that is actually necessary only with the necessity of precept brings with it the loss of the good resulting from obedience to the command itself. When a person has no cognizance of the command, the fact that he does not observe it in no way involves him in an act of disobedience. If the reality envisioned in the command is necessary only with the necessity of precept, then the absence of that reality from the life of a person who is invincibly ignorant of the precept does not prevent that person from obtaining the good to which the reality itself is orientated.

Thus, when the textbooks of sacred theology state that the Church is necessary with the necessity of means, they intend to say that this society is in a real way requisite for the attainment of eternal salvation in the sense that a man who, whether through his own fault or not, does not belong to it in some manner at the moment of his death cannot attain to the Beatific Vision. Scholastic literature recognizes the fact that there is a divine command that all men should enter the true Church of Jesus Christ, and that, for this reason, it is perfectly correct to say that the Church is necessary with the necessity of precept. In teaching that the Church is truly necessary with the necessity of means, the theologians take cognizance of the fact that this society is necessary not merely with the necessity of precept, and that all men must enter it in some real way if they are to obtain the life of heaven. They assert that a person who dies apart from association with the true Church, even though that lack of association itself is not his fault, will not and cannot obtain the Beatific Vision.

Many of the theologians who use this terminology teach at some length about a distinction between two types of realities which are necessary with the necessity of means. One of these divisions includes those things which are requisite for the attainment of the good to which they are ordered in such a way that the necessary thing must be possessed in itself if that ulterior good is to be possessed. The other class is that of the realities which must be possessed or at least desired or intended if the end is to be obtained. They give sanctifying grace and the *habitus* of charity as examples of the first class of objects, pointing to the fact that no one can enter heaven at all unless he dies in the state of sanctifying grace and in possession of the virtue of charity. The sacrament of Baptism and the Church itself are taken as examples of the second type of things described as necessary with the necessity of means. There is no substitute for sanctifying grace. The person who does not possess this quality at the moment of death will not enter heaven. There is, however, a substitute for the actual reception of the sacrament of Baptism. A man who actually intends to receive this sacrament but who dies before he can be baptized may be saved by virtue of his intention. The Church is allocated within this class of necessary realities. It is said to be requisite for the attainment of the Beatific Vision in the sense that no man can enter heaven unless he is joined to the Church as a member or by his intention of becoming a member.

A further elaboration of the teaching has reference to the quality of this intention, which suffices to put a man "within" the Church in a way sufficient to make it possible for him to attain to the Beatific Vision. Serious theologians take cognizance of the fact that this salvific desire of the Church may be implicit. They are aware that a man can be really desirous of entering the Church without being clearly aware of the nature and the identity of this society, in much the same way that a man would truly intend to take a ferry ride from Jersey City to Manhattan if he set out to ride from Washington to New York on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. The intention to take this transportation would involve the intention of taking a ferry ride even on the part of a man who did not realize that this particular railroad has these arrangements for bringing its passengers into New York.

Similarly, a man who knows nothing about the nature or the identity of Our Lord's true Church could intend to enter that society by reason of his will to work for the supernatural glory of God through the salvation of his own soul in Jesus Christ. Such an intention, in the case of a person invincibly ignorant of the nature and the identity of the Church itself, would put that person "within" the Church in such a way as to allow him to enter heaven if he should die before his intention had the chance to bring him to an explicit knowledge of the Church and to actual membership in it.

Such, in its broad outline, is the best statement and explanation of the Catholic Church's necessity for salvation to be found in contemporary manuals of scholastic theology. Constructed principally on the line of investigation into the meaning of the term "necessity," this type of explanation, though comparatively new in the field of theology, is definitely accurate and effective. It is not, however, the only type of explanation possible. It is possible to state and to explain the Church's necessity for salvation in terms of the concept of salvation itself, and in function of a dynamic and realistic notion of the Church. An explanation built up along these lines will in no way contradict or minimize the teaching of the better manuals. It will, however, throw a much more perfect light on the whole thesis, and it should prove of value in our times, when, as the Holy Father complains in the encyclical *Humani generis*, certain people seek to reduce this teaching to an empty formula.

In the actual deposit of divine and Catholic faith, the notion of the Church is intimately bound up with that of man's supernatural salvation. This concept of salvation is one of the ideas most frequently occurring in the New Testament presentation of divine public revelation. It is, moreover, a complex notion. Thus, for example, the Christian people are sometimes represented as "saved" here and now, and sometimes bidden to await their "salvation." In his First Epistle to the Corinthians and in his Epistle to the Ephesians, St. Paul represents salvation as in some way already attained by the Christians themselves. To the Corinthians he wrote that "the word of the cross, to them indeed that perish, is foolishness: but to them that are saved, that is, to us, it is the power of God."[1]

---

[1] *I Cor.* 1:18.

He told the Ephesians that they are saved by the grace of Christ and through faith.[2]

On the other hand, in several of the passages in St. Paul's epistles, salvation is spoken of as something to be realized in the future. Thus, for example, in the Epistle to the Romans St. Paul wrote that "now our salvation is nearer than when we believed."[3] And, in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians he testified that his activity was for the "exhortation and salvation" of the faithful.[4] The Philippians were commanded to work out their salvation with fear and trembling.[5]

In the divinely revealed message, the process of salvation is depicted as long and complex. There is a point or situation from which men are saved, and there is obviously some good position into which they are brought by that process. This much is obvious from the very concept of salvation itself. It is impossible to save a man except from some condition or situation in which he is placed disadvantageously, and in which he is in serious danger of ruin. We speak of a man being saved from drowning when he is taken out of the water, in which he would most certainly die after a short time, and brought to some place where he may continue to live. In exactly the same way, a man is saved in the supernatural order when he is taken from some position in which he would suffer the loss of eternal life and brought into a position in which that life may be exercised. Ultimately, of course, his salvation is achieved when he is brought from a position in which it is possible for him to lose his life of grace into a situation in which he will exercise that life of grace forever in the Beatific Vision.

The *terminus a quo* in the process of supernatural salvation is always the condition of sin or aversion from God. The statement of the angel to St. Joseph, a statement which brings out the primary purpose of the Incarnation itself, asserts that Our Lord "shall save his people from their sins."[6] In precisely the same way, however, the process of salvation essentially involves taking men out of the social entity which is in some way under the domination of Satan and bringing them into the family or kingdom of Our Lord. The

---

[2] Cf. *Eph.* 2:5, 8.

[3] *Rom.* 13:11.

[4] Cf. *II Cor.* 1:6.

[5] Cf. *Phil.* 2:12.

[6] Cf. *Mt.* 1:21.

Acts of the Apostles show that St. Peter, at the close of his exhortation and instruction on the first Christian Pentecost, urged his hearers that they should save themselves from this perverse generation. The following verse adds that "They therefore that received his word were baptized: and there were added in that day about three thousand souls."[7]

Thus it is clear that the immediate *terminus ad quem* of the process of salvation necessarily involves the *ecclesia,* the company within which Our Lord dwells and rules. The words of the Acts of the Apostles make it clear that St. Peter saw no way to escape from the dominion of the prince of this world other than through association with the company of Jesus Christ. There is no salvation or freedom from sin apart from Our Lord, and there is no association with Him apart from His Body which is the Catholic Church.

The ultimate *terminus ad quem* of the process of salvation is obviously the Beatific Vision itself. It is made clear throughout the course of Christian dogma that there is no possibility of obtaining this good other than by an association with Our Lord in this world, in such a way that only those who die thus associated with Him can achieve the Beatific Vision. Thus the fellowship with Our Lord in the Church militant is represented as a necessary factor or condition for entrance into the Church triumphant. Or, to put the matter in another way, the salvation Christ died to obtain for us actually comes only to His people. The *ecclesia* is precisely the society of His people.

The basic concept of the Church itself definitely involves that of salvation. Basically the Church on earth is the company of those who are associated with Our Lord by the profession of their baptismal faith in Him. This *congregatio fidelium* is then the association within which alone men are to find the fellowship of Christ, the union with Him by virtue of which they are rescued from the status of enemies of God and subjects of the supreme spiritual enemy of God, and brought into the household of their Creator.

We must not allow ourselves to forget that, over the course of the centuries, the heretics did not deny this basic concept of the Church. The Protestant writers of the first period of the Reformation made no effort to reject or to mutilate this notion. They only sought to apply it to an unorganized collection of the just, or the elect, in this world. The Catholic writers, upholding the divinely revealed supernatural message of Jesus Christ, showed that this *ecclesia fidelium* of the New Testament was actually the organized religious society over which the Bishop of Rome presides as the Vicar of Christ on earth.

---

[7] *Acts* 2:40.

Precisely because it is the *ecclesia fidelium* or the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, the Catholic Church is the institution which works and struggles for the glory of God in this world. In that work it is faced with the determined opposition of the world, and of the prince of this world. That is why, among the great historical and biblical names of the Church, we find such titles as the City of God, and the Camp of the Saints.

Thus, every man who works for God in this world is actually fighting with the Church militant against its enemies, and the enemies of God Himself. And, conversely, every man who is a friend of God, animated with that charity which is the supernatural love of friendship for God, is actually fighting with the Catholic Church, and, to that extent at least "within" it. The love of charity is essentially a dynamic thing. A man who possesses it is orientated towards God in the very real sense that he is actually working for God's glory and the salvation of souls. The work of charity is precisely the work of the Church. Thus it is absolutely impossible for a man to be in the state of grace and possessed of true charity without working towards the end to which all the efforts of the Catholic Church are directed.

This dynamic aspect of the basic notion of the Church is an element which should help greatly towards the understanding of the Church's real necessity for salvation. Actually, despite the fact that it is one of the oldest elements in the theology of the Catholic Church, it has never been presented more effectively than by Pope Leo XIII in the encyclical *Humanum genus*.

> The race of man, after its miserable fall from God, the Creator and the Giver of heavenly gifts, "through the envy of the devil," separated into two diverse and opposite parts, of which the one steadfastly contends for truth and virtue, the other for those things that are contrary to virtue and to truth. The one is the kingdom of God on earth, namely, the true Church of Jesus Christ; and those who desire from their heart to be united with it, so as to gain salvation, must of necessity serve God and His only-begotten Son with their whole mind and with an entire will. The other is the kingdom of Satan, in whose possession and con-

trol are all whosoever follow the fatal example of their leader and of our first parents, those who refuse to obey the divine and eternal law, and who have many aims of their own in contempt of God, and many aims also against God.

This twofold kingdom St. Augustine keenly discerned and described after the manner of two cities, contrary in their laws because striving for contrary objects; and with a subtle brevity he expressed the efficient cause of each in these words: "Two loves formed two cities: the love of self, reaching even to contempt of God, an earthly city; and the love of God, reaching to contempt of self, a heavenly one." At every period of time each has been in conflict with the other, with a variety and multiplicity of weapons and of warfare, although not always with equal ardor and assault.[8]

Since the Church itself is essentially a dynamic institution, and since the virtue of charity is something which, of its very nature, moves the man who possesses it to strive for the cause of God, it follows that any individual possessing the life of charity is necessarily striving for the good of the Catholic Church. He is within the Church, in the same way that a Korean volunteer would be with the American army, when he fights with the members of that army for the good which he and the army seek to bring about.

The struggle for the cause of God in this world is carried on by the Church militant alone, not by any federation of agencies within which the Church has merely an outstanding part to play. The Church of God has no corporate allies in this salvific struggle. It is the City of God, the social entity which is in conflict with the "earthly city" described by St. Augustine. No other religious societies are associated with it. Furthermore, according to the merciful designs of God's providence, this City of God of the New Testament is a fully organized society. It is the Catholic Church. It is a visible society, whose members are readily recognizable by the visible signs which constitute the external bond of unity within the Church.

In our own day it is very easy to lose sight of the fact that it is precisely this visible society which alone carries on the struggle for God in the world. We have become so accustomed to speak of some iniquitous legislation as contrary, "not only to Catholicism but to all religion," to think of books as appealing "not only to Catholics but to persons of every religious belief," that we tend to imagine that the army that works for God's supernatural glory on earth is a kind of amalgamation of the Church and other organizations of "men of good will." If we succumb to that tendency, we are, in the final analysis, supporting the old heretical thesis that the Church itself has repudiated time and time again. We are favoring the thesis of the old Reformers, a thesis which the master theologians of the Catholic Church have successfully exposed and destroyed long ago.

---

[8] Translation from *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903), p. 83.

Thus it follows that the intention of divine charity, the intention to work and struggle for God's supernatural glory in this world is, in point of fact, nothing but a willingness to work for the intention characteristic of and proper to the Catholic Church. It is possible for a man to work for that purpose, to be animated by that intention, without actually being a member of this true and visible Church of Jesus Christ. But it definitely is not possible for a man to work for the intention of charity in this world without finding himself "within" the Church, to the extent that he is laboring in association with it for the very purpose towards which it is directed by its divine constitution.

When St. Ambrose spoke of the possibility of heaven for a man who died as a catechumen,[9] that is, without achieving actual membership in the Catholic Church, he was taking cognizance of this situation. He was well aware of the fact that any man who dies in the state of sanctifying grace will attain to the Beatific Vision. Thus, in stating that a man who died in the status of a catechumen could enter into heaven, he was merely asserting the fundamental Christian teaching that it is possible to have the life of sanctifying grace and the forgiveness of sins without *membership* in the true Church. Or, to put the matter in terms of the axiom with reference to the Church's necessity for salvation, he was asserting that it is possible to be *within* the Church as a man fighting for the purpose of the Church against the prince of this world without being a member of this society.

The catechumen about whom St. Ambrose spoke was a man well instructed about the Church, a man who intended to enter this society as a member, and who was only awaiting the proper opportunity to do so. Thus this man had an obvious intention or desire

[9] Cf. *De obitu Valentiniani*, n. 51, *MPL*, XVI, 1374, *CSEL*, V, 109.

to enter the Church. According to Catholic principles, however, it is possible for a man to be in the state of grace, and thus working for God's supernatural charity on earth, without any explicit knowledge of the Catholic Church at all. Catholic theologians are in complete accord that there is a minimum possible explicit content of divine faith, a basic knowledge of the truths revealed by God in His divine and public message which men must possess explicitly in order that they may possess salvific faith. They are agreed, in general, that this basic content must include an awareness of God as the Author of the supernatural order, a knowledge of God as the Rewarder of good and as the Punisher of evil, and an explicit grasp of the mysteries of the Blessed Trinity and of the Incarnation. There is general agreement that an explicit knowledge of the Church is not included in this minimum requisite for the possession of salvific faith.

So it is that, according to Catholic teaching, it is possible for a man to possess the virtue of theological charity without having an explicit desire of entering the true Church as a member of this society. It definitely is not possible, however, for a man to possess charity without having some explicit desire of the good for which the Church works. The Church labors and struggles on earth for the supernatural glory of God, for the salvation of souls, and for the overcoming of the evil and error that stand in the way of God's glory. Charity, in the last analysis, is the virtue which, as an affection of supernatural friendship for God, works for precisely these ends. Thus, to state the case in terms of the thesis on the necessity of the Church, a man may be within the Church in a manner which will suffice to bring him to the Beatific Vision by a merely implicit desire to become a member of the Church. For this same effect, however, he must have a desire that is at least to a certain extent explicit to work for that end which is really the purpose to which the Church is essentially orientated.

Although this work of charity is compatible with an invincible ignorance of the Catholic Church, we must not forget that the force of the love of friendship for God automatically impels a man along the road to a knowledge of the Church and to actual membership in this society. It is in this way that we must understand the teaching of the theologians on the unitive force of charity itself. The supernatural love of friendship for God is by its very nature a power that tends to bring men together in the visible company of Our Lord's disciples. Thus the man who possesses and is animated by the virtue of charity is actually one who is working towards entrance into the membership of the Catholic Church. His love for God would involve, not only an explicit intention of laboring for the achievement of that objective to which the Church is directed, but also at least an implicit intention of becoming a member of this society.

In a man of even ordinary intelligence, this charity would seem to be utterly incompatible with profound hostility towards the Catholic Church. Some modern writers in the field of theology hold the opposite view, but there is overwhelming evidence against the validity of their claims. The man who hates and who works to stir up hatred against the Catholic Church is directing his efforts against the supernatural kingdom of God on earth. He is working against the society within which God Himself lives and operates for His own glory and for the salvation of men. He is striving against a society which carries with it the indisputable evidence of its own salvific status. Consequently, whether he realizes the fact or not, he is one of the *θεομάχοι* spoken of by Gamaliel;[10] he is one of those men who are fighting against God.

It is hard to see how any man could possibly attack the Catholic Church and seek to stir up hatred against it without being guilty of serious sin. Such an individual has either taken the trouble to make a serious study of the Church or he has failed to do so, out of neglect or by reason of prejudice. It seems utterly impossible that a man of average intelligence could begin a serious study of the Catholic Church without coming to realize that there is strong and manifest evidence in favor of the fundamental claim of this Church, the assertion that it is actually the kingdom of God on earth, the association within which Jesus Christ lives and rules. And, if such a man approaches the teaching of the Church with the qualities of mind and of will which God demands in a seeker after His truth, he will most certainly come to understand that the dogma of the Catholic Church is credible as divine revelation. Should a man attack and persecute the Church while he is aware that its claims with regard to Christ might possibly be justified, he is certainly guilty of acting in contempt of God. Surely it is inconceivable that such a person could be excused by reason of invincible ignorance.

---

[10] Cf. *Acts* 5:39.

If he neglects to examine the claims and the evidence of the Catholic Church by reason of laziness or carelessness, exactly the same holds true. He is attacking rashly an institution which presents serious and impressive evidence in support of its claim to be the authentic company of the disciples of Christ in this world. If, on the other hand, he omits this examination by reason of his prejudice against the Church, then this unreasonable and objectively false prejudice is itself voluntary and evil. The words of Cardinal Newman in his *Present Position of Catholics in England* are quite apposite here.

> But prejudice, in its second and ordinary sense, in which I have now for some time been using it—viz., as an impression or stain on the mind is not at all innocent or excusable, just the reverse. This may surprise you; you may say, How can a man help his impressions? he is passive under them; they come of themselves; he is as little answerable for what is stamped upon his mind, as for a wound which is inflicted on his body; but this is very far from the case, as a little consideration will show. The will goes with prejudice; there is no compulsion or necessity; those who have prejudices are unwilling to give them up; there is no prejudice without the will; we are prejudiced, I say, because we will; and therefore, if we did not will, we should not be prejudiced. I do not say we could get rid of the prejudice in a day by wishing to do so; but we should, in that case, be tending to get rid of it.[11]

The antagonistic attitudes and prejudices against the true Church of Jesus Christ thus characterize faults against the natural law itself, and are incompatible with the charity which is the unitive force bringing non-members of the Church "within" this society in a way which would save them "within" the Church should they die before they have the opportunity of becoming actual members of the Church. And, for the same reason, whatever tends to break down these false prejudices is directed towards the glory of God, the purpose of divine charity.

There has been a tendency in recent times to hold that membership in the Church is necessary only with the necessity of precept, while admitting that the Church itself is necessary with the necessity of means. To a certain extent, that is, as far as the individual alone is concerned, this teaching is quite accurate. A man can attain to the Beatific Vision without being actually a member of the true Church, although he cannot reach this goal without fighting alongside the members of the Church, and thus in some way "within" this organization, for the objective towards which the efforts of the Church militant are directed.

---

[11] *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England* (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1896), pp. 233 f.

At the same time, however, there is another sense in which membership in the Church is necessary with more than a mere necessity of precept. This is from the point of view of the Church militant itself, the City of God in the New Testament dispensation. According to the plans of God's providence, the struggle for His supernatural glory and against the forces hostile to Him is to be carried on, during this last status of His kingdom on earth, by that kingdom as an organized social unit. In other words, the kingdom of God in the New Testament period is an organization with true members. If the struggle for the cause of Christ were carried on mainly or principally by a group joined together merely by the internal bonds of faith, hope, and charity, and not by those external bonds which constitute membership in the Catholic Church, the work for God in this world would be completely frustrated. The divine plan of salvation includes membership in the Church for the work of the *ecclesia* of the New Testament.

* * * * *

There is one final remark which must be made about the treatise on the necessity of the Catholic Church for eternal salvation. This is not the section of sacred theology in which we explain and prove the divine justice and mercy. Too many of those who have gone astray on this portion of the sacred science have been led into error by their ill-considered efforts to show how God acts justly with regard to those who have never been sufficiently instructed about the Church. They have sought to "soften" the teaching on this point, on the pretext that the teaching of the Church's real necessity for eternal salvation is not sufficiently "consoling" and that it does not explain the divine attributes of justice and mercy.

Such an attitude is, in the final analysis, dominated by a rather crude anthropomorphism. The persons who are misled into adopting it have come to depict God as a kind of super-human but still limited Being. They have imagined that a man could, as it were, be more generous and good than God Himself.

In the face of such an attitude, not only the thesis on the necessity of the Church, but every other portion of divinely revealed truth as well, would lose all of its significance.

In point of fact, it is the all-good and all-merciful God who has constituted the Church as really necessary for eternal and supernatural salvation. He has made it the one agency for fellowship with His Son, who died upon the Cross for the salvation of men. It exists as a necessary society, not to constitute an obstacle for men of good will, but precisely as the household or family wherein the brothers and the sisters of Jesus Christ work out their own salvation in laboring and struggling for God's glory in this world.

No creature ever can be more generous than God. Actually, whatever there is of good in the creature is something that comes to that creature from God Himself. If any man begins to work towards the friendship of God, it is by virtue of the healing and operating grace that God has granted freely to him. Every man who co-operates freely with that grace and who continues to do so will eventually come to that salvation which Our Lord sacrificed Himself to obtain for men. He will come to that salvation by the force of the grace God gives to Him. He will find that salvation in the Church of God.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

LOVE OF GOD AND HATRED FOR SIN

Hatred for sin and love of God are two sides of the same golden coin. By constantly avoiding sin—not only mortal sin but also, as far as possible, all deliberate venial sin—the soul makes clear its ardent love of God. And it is impossible that anyone should strive continually and with a right intention to eradicate in himself all that leads to sin, without at the same time growing in union with God; just as it is impossible to approach even a little towards intimacy with God without a pitched battle against sin. Consequently, every effort we make to destroy the traces of sin in ourselves, to guard ourselves against personal failings, fosters at the same time our union with God.

—Fernand Paradis, p.S.S., in *Synthèse théologique sur le renoncement chrètien* (Montreal: Grand Séminaire, 1945), p. 107.

Answers to Questions

STATION OF THE CROSS PROBLEM

Question: Recently we removed all the stations of the cross while the Church was being redecorated. At the same time we removed the extremely large frame from the pictures and in order to do so we had to remove the cross from the station itself. Did the stations thus lose the indulgence attached to the Way of the Cross?

Answer: The stations do not lose their indulgence if they are moved or changed in the same church or place. However, if at least seven of the crosses are removed or destroyed simultaneously or successively, authors hold that the stations lose their blessing, since they have been morally changed. One or two of the crosses may be changed without a new blessing being required.

If new stations have been erected in the *same* place where other stations had been previously canonically erected, it is only required that a priest who is authorized by competent authority, repeat that part of the ceremony which contains the blessing of the crosses. When a new church replaces another on almost the same spot and under the same title, the stations can be transferred simpliciter without any further ceremony. However, if the stations are transferred to a morally different place, the same ceremony and blessing is required as for the original erection (cf. Bonzelet, *Pastoral Companion*).

ORDO TO BE FOLLOWED

Question: A short time ago, I visited at the house of a religious order on a day when their ordo differed from mine. What ordo was I to follow? Also, their *oratio imperata* differed from the one my Ordinary had decreed to be said. Which *oratio imperata* was I to say?

Answer: When offering the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass the ordo of the place is to be followed. In this case the ordo of the religious order was to be followed for Mass. The *oratio imperata* for Mass was the one ordered, not by your own Ordinary, but the one requested by the Bishop of the diocese where you were offering Mass

ASH WEDNESDAY PROBLEM

Question: Ash Wednesday occurred while we were having Forty Hours' Devotion. What should we have done about the blessing of the ashes during Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament? What should be done with the ashes that remain after the ceremony? Am I permitted to distribute ashes at my mission church on the first Sunday of Lent?

Answer: The Sacred Congregation of Rites (4057, VI) instructs us to bless the ashes at an altar away from the one where Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament is taking place. After the ceremony the ashes are to be placed in the sacrarium or buried so that no profanation will occur. Where people have been hindered from receiving the blessed ashes on Ash Wednesday on account of distance from church or working conditions or any other reasonable excuse, it is permitted to distribute ashes before or after Mass on the first Sunday of Lent (cf. Mueller-Ellis, *Handbook of Ceremonics*).

MANNER OF IMPOSING ASHES ON CLERICS

Question: When a cleric presents himself for ashes on Ash Wednesday, is it proper for him to receive them on his tonsure?

Answer: The Missal rubrics read very simply: "cineres imponit in capite." The *Memoriale rituum* states the ceremony almost as simply: "in modum crucis imponit in capite." From that it is clear that nothing directly is mentioned as to where precisely the ashes are to be placed when imposed on clerics. Stercky, in his *Manuel de liturgie et cérémonial,* remarks that the rubrics do not specify whether ashes are to be placed on the tonsure, on the middle of the head, or on the forehead. Consequently, he says, one is free to follow the established custom. Van Der Stappen, in his *Sacra liturgia,* writes that the ashes are to be sprinkled on the tonsure of clerics and on the forehead of the laity. De Herdt, in his *Sacrae liturgiae praxis,* agrees with Van Der Stappen. Fr. Laurence O'Connell (*Book of Ceremonies*), writing for ceremonies in this country, instructs us to place the ashes on the forehead of the laity and on the tonsure of the clerics. He quotes Callewaert to the effect that ashes may be placed even on the hair of lay people but not on the covering of the head.

Thus we can conclude that approved authors sanction the custom of placing the ashes on the tonsure of clerics where the custom obtains but that there is no hard and fast rule that such custom and no other must be observed.

ORATIONES IMPERATAE

Question: What rule must be followed regarding the *oratio imperata* when the Bishop has ordered two of them to be said in the diocese?

Answer: If the *orationes imperatae* are the same (e.g., *pro re gravi* or *pro re non gravi*), the prayer of a mystery will precede that of the Blessed Mother or a Saint. Thus, the prayer to the Holy Spirit would take precedence over that to a Saint. If the prayers are taken from the *Orationes diversae,* the order of the Missal is to be kept. Whatever takes precedence in the Missal will retain that order in carrying out the prescriptions of the Bishop. If the *orationes diversae* are not of the same rank or classification, the one of greater importance or urgency will take precedence.

BENEDICTION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

Question: For Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament in a parish church on Sunday afternoon or evening are a certain number of people required? Is there such a thing as a necessary quorum?

Answer: It is impossible to determine exactly or mathematically the number of people that must be present for conducting Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. In common law nothing has been determined about the exact number. It is within the Ordinary's power to determine how many must be present at this service for the necessary reverence to the Blessed Sacrament. We must be careful that due reverence is always given to the Blessed Sacrament and this cannot exist without a certain number of people assisting.

THANKSGIVING AFTER MASS

Question: When a priest is making his thanksgiving in the sanctuary or serving Mass in lieu of an altar boy should he not wear a surplice?

Answer: To say the least, the ideal thing for a priest is to wear a surplice when making his thanksgiving and especially so in the sanctuary. One should be prompted to do so, keeping in mind that he has just received Holy Communion and offered the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. We instruct our altar boys to wear cassock and surplice and what conclusion can they draw except lack of reverence when they see us unproperly dressed?

INDULGENCES ATTACHED TO BREVIARY

Question: Are there any special indulgences attached to the recitation of the breviary?

Answer: Those obliged to recite the divine office can gain a plenary indulgence under the usual conditions if they say it devoutly before the Blessed Sacrament, whether exposed or reserved in the tabernacle. If only part of the office is recited before the Blessed Sacrament, there is an indulgence of 500 days for each canonical hour (cf. *Raccolta*).

FIRST MASS INDULGENCE

Question: Is the indulgence attached to the First Mass of a newly ordained priest applied to his first low Mass or first Solemn High Mass?

Answer: A newly ordained priest gains a plenary indulgence on the day of his first holy Mass and not necessarily his first Solemn Mass. His relatives within the third degree can likewise gain a plenary indulgence if they assist at this first Mass. Both the priest and his relatives necessarily must fulfill the usual conditions, confession, Communion and prayers for the intention of Our Holy Father.

BLESSING OF ST. BLASE

Question: Is the blessing of St. Blase limited to only Feb. 3? Must the candles touch the throat of the person being blessed? Are the candles to be lighted?

Answer: The blessing of St. Blase can be given any place and at any time and not only on the feast of the Saint. Fr. O'Connell in his *Book of Ceremonies* instructs us to have the candles crossed and to hold them close to the throat of the person receiving the blessing. It is not necessary that the candles touch the throat of the person being blessed. The Sacred Congregation of Rites in 1936 decreed that the candles need not be lighted for the bestowal of the blessing of St. Blase.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

THE PROXY GODPARENT

Question: Recently I officiated at a Baptism, at which neither of the two designated godparents could be present. However, each of the two had sent a letter to the child's mother, naming as proxy a person whom I had suggested. I forgot to notify these proxies; hence, they did not appear for the ceremony, and could not be reached. I called in two other persons, and asked them to act as proxies, if this could be done validly. Realizing, however, that the mandate of the sponsors made no provision for any proxies except the two they had designated, I told these two substitutes to have the intention of acting as sponsors if otherwise the child would be deprived of sponsors. They agreed, and the mother of the child, hearing me make this arrangement, apparently approved of it. What is necessary that one may be validly designated as proxy for a godparent at Baptism? Who are the real godparents of the child in the case described?

Answer: That a person validly act as proxy for a godparent, it is necessary that the godparent depute him to represent him, and that the one thus deputed accept the office. Proof of this delegation must be given to the officiating priest—usually by a document bearing the signature of the sponsor. It suffices for the delegation that the sponsor give a general mandate—for example, designating as his proxy anyone whom the priest or the parents may choose, even though this person is entirely unknown to him (the sponsor). If, however, the godparent has selected a particular person to act as his proxy, the priest or the child's parents cannot substitute another. Whereas the selection of the *sponsor* pertains to an infant's parents, or to the priest, according to Canon 765, §4, the designation of a *proxy* is the right of the sponsor himself. It is true, the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments has decided that when a custom prevails whereby a proxy is designated by the parents without any mandate from the sponsor, and the sponsor knows of such a custom and intends to conform to it, the absent sponsor becomes validly the child's godparent. However, at the same time the Congregation reprobated this custom, because it reduces the office of sponsor to a meaningless ceremony and deprives the pastor of the opportunity of investigating the qualifications of the sponsor (cf. *AAS*, XVIII [1926], 43; Beste, *Introductio in codicem* [Collegeville, 1944], p. 481).

Applying these principles to the case presented, it would seem that the absent sponsors did not validly become the child's godparents. For they had designated determined persons to represent them, and these did not officiate. There was no designation, in any way, of anyone else; hence the parents and the priest had no right to appoint substitutes. However, presuming that the mother agreed to the priest's arrangement, whereby the two who assisted at the Baptism were to be the real sponsors if they could not act as proxies, these two persons are actually the child's godparents.

AN OBSTETRICAL PROBLEM

Question: An obstetrician, assisting at a birth, finds that the child's head is so lodged in the mother's body that a forceful application of the forceps will be necessary to extract it, and this process is likely to injure the infant or even to kill it. On the other hand, if the child is left in its position, it will surely die soon. What is the obstetrician to do?

Answer: The Catholic Church teaches that it is always a violation of God's law to kill the unborn child directly—for example, by such operations as craniotomy or embryotomy. Even if the life of the mother is in danger unless the child is removed, no direct action that will surely cause death can be taken against the infant, as long as there is probability that life is present. However, it can happen that there is a slight probability that a procedure, such as the use of forceps, will succeed in delivering the child alive, though it will surely die if this procedure is not attempted. In such a case, the doctor may have recourse to this process, even though its use may actually accelerate the death of the child. For in such a case the direct purpose of the doctor's action is the delivery of a living child; the death of the infant, if it occurs, is only an indirect effect, permitted for a sufficient reason, the fact that this is the only procedure that offers a chance of life to the little one. Injuries inflicted on the child in the course of such a procedure are justifiable on the principle that it is lawful to mutilate the body for the preservation of life—the same principle that justifies the excision of a limb that is diseased. It should be added that, according to reliable medical testimony, a case such as that described by the questioner will rarely occur if a pregnant woman has recourse to the services of a competent obstetrician in the course of her pregnancy.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the April, 1901, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* the leading article, by Fr. H. T. Henry, presents the translation of an Easter hymn, ascribed to St. Peter Damian, the original Latin of which is a combination of iambic and trochaic verse. . . . Continuing his series of articles on "The Support of Sick, Old, and Delinquent Clergymen," Fr. Anselm Kroll describes various methods of raising funds for this purpose, used in the United States, Canada, Mexico, and some European lands. . . . Fr. E. Magevney, S.J., describes the pernicious effects of the Reformation on education during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. . . . The editor, Fr. Heuser, contributes a lengthy review of the revised edition of the *Index librorum prohibitorum*, which appeared in 1900. . . . A favorite question of theologians—whether the subdiaconate can be conferred by a simple priest with the authorization of the Sovereign Pontiff—is discussed in the Conference section, and an affirmative answer given. The response adds that there is no record in the Roman archives to substantiate the view that the power to confer the diaconate was granted to Cistercian abbots by Pope Innocent VIII. . . . A lengthy defense of Fr. Billot's opinion concerning the causality of the sacraments is given by Fr. Charles Cronin, of the English College in Rome, in reply to a previous article by Dr. A. MacDonald. . . . A letter is published from a priest who believes that we should not be too timid or technical in judging the qualities of the wine required for Mass, but should accept unhesitatingly as valid matter whatever is pronounced wine by an ordinary good judge of such commodities.

F. J. C.

Analecta

The issue of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* dated Dec. 9, 1950, contains the text of the radio mesage sent by our Holy Father on Oct. 1, 1950,[1] to the Catholics of England assembled in London to participate in ceremonies marking the observance of the centenary of the restoration of the hierarchy in England and Wales. In it the Pope pointed to the past glories of Catholic England, to its saints and martyrs, and to the outstanding services rendered the Church by Cardinals Newman and Manning. He said that he was gratified with the remarkable growth of Catholic influence that followed the restoration of the hierarchy. He encouraged the Catholics of Wales to remember their martyrs, Blessed Richard Gwyn and Blessed David Lewis, and to take courage from their example in surmounting the difficulties that attend the practice of their religion in that rugged land. He spoke a word also to the non-Catholics of England, assuring them that they had a place in his heart and in his prayers. The Apostolic Legate to the liturgical observance of the centenary was Bernard Cardinal Griffin, who received this appointment in a letter dated Sept. 16, 1950.[2]

In the encyclical letter of Dec. 6, 1950,[3] our Holy Father sought the participation of the hierarchy, the clergy, and the faithful in the prayers of petition for the peace of the world, an intention for which he celebrated Mass at midnight before the Feast of the Immaculate Conception. In this letter he asked them to pray for the same intention during the novena preceding the Feast of Christmas, and he encouraged them to be especially mindful of the needs of the Church, praying for the restoration of its liberty, particularly in lands in which prison and exile is the lot of those who defend those rights.

On Oct. 14, 1950,[4] our Holy Father delivered an allocution to the delegates attending in Rome the meetings of the International Catechetical Congress. In it he insisted on the importance of fundamentals, asserting that laws, decrees, practices, and ceremonies are dependent upon doctrine, i.e. upon dogmatic truth, the laws of morality, and the principles of liturgical worship. Since the delegates before him aimed at imparting this doctrine, their labors and those of their colleagues rank among the foremost of all apostolic undertakings. The Pope showed that priests should not forget that this work is primarily their responsibility and he reminded them that experience demonstrates that it is a most effective means of stirring in the young an enduring loyalty to the priesthood and to the Church.

---

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XLII (1950), 825.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 806.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 797.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 816.

On July 18, 1950[5] a new accord was signed by plenipotentiaries of the Holy See and the Republic of Portugal adjusting the mutual relations of the parties with respect to the appointments to Sees in India. Under this new accord, Portugal surrendered its right of presentation in regard to the Sees of Mangalore, Quilon, Trichinopoly, Cochim, San Tommaso di Meliapor, and Bombay and expressed its recognition of the fact that the Holy See is no longer under any obligation to consult the President of the Republic in reference to the appointment to the Sees of Cochim and San Tommaso di Meliapor of candidates of Portuguese nationality, a situation it also conceded to exist in regard to the alternating rotation in the archdiocesan See of Bombay of an incumbent of Portuguese and of British nationality.

In a letter of Sept. 23, 1950,[6] our Holy Father appointed Emanuel Goncalves Cardinal Cerejeira, Patriarch of Lisbon, as Apostolic Legate to the ceremonial observance of the fourth centenary of the death of St. John of God. In a letter of Oct. 18, 1950,[7] he extended his congratulations to the Rector of the Pontifical Portuguese College in Rome on the occasion of the observance of its fiftieth anniversary; he praised the sacrifices made by the Portuguese hierarchy in its support and he expressed his gratification with its success in training a numerous and loyal priesthood for the service of their fellow countrymen.

Letters to the Archbishop of Palermo, Ernesto Cardinal Ruffini, dated Sept. 6, 1950,[8] and Sept. 9, 1950,[9] appointed him Apostolic Legate to the ceremonies in Rosario, Argentina, attending respectively a congress held in the interests of promoting vocations to the priesthood and a national Eucharistic Congress.

---

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 811.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 808.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 809.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 884.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 886.

Letters Apostolic of July 17, 1950,[10] established the Apostolic Delegation of Karachi in Pakistan. Letters Apostolic of preceding years are reported in the Dec. 26 issue of the *Acta*: viz., Letters of Nov. 9, 1945,[11] by which the Blessed Virgin under the title of her Immaculate Conception was named the Patroness of the Diocese of Raleigh; and Letters of May 30, 1948,[12] by which the Cathedral of Sigüenza, Spain, was granted the honors of a Minor Basilica.

Letters Apostolic of Oct. 15, 1950,[13] beatified Blessed Anna Maria Javouhey and similar Letters of Nov. 12, 1950,[14] conferred the same honor on Blessed Marguerite Bourgeoys, for whose beatification a decree of Nov. 6, 1950,[15] issued by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, paved the way. The practice of heroic virtue on the part of Pius X was declared in a decree of the same Sacred Congregation dated Sept. 3, 1950.[16] The same Sacred Congregation by a decree of April 3, 1950,[17] authorized the reassumption of the Cause of the Jesuit, Blessed Antonio Baldinucci.

The Sacred Consistorial Congregation authorized changes in the boundaries of dioceses by decrees of July 11, 1950,[18] and Sept. 15, 1950.[19] In the former it gave portions of the territory of the Diocese of Noto in Sicily to the Diocese of Ragusa and to the Archdiocese of Syracuse. In the latter it transferred to the Diocese of Trapani in Sicily several towns previously belonging to the Diocese of Mazzara del Vallo.

Changes in territorial extension were made also by decrees of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, which in a decree of July 20, 1950,[20] entrusted the care of souls in Japan to the native clergy, permitting the Jesuits to retain, *ad nutum*, their authority in the Vicariate of Hiroshima. A decree of May 5, 1950,[21] transferred to the Diocese of Bathurst certain portions of the Archdiocese of Sydney; a decree of the same date[22] made a similar transfer to the Diocese of Portaugusta of portions of the Archdiocese of Adelaide. A decree of May 26, 1950,[23] provided for the co-terminous extent with the civil provinces of the Apostolic Vicariates of Douala, Foumban, and Yaoundé. Through the decree of June 9, 1950,[24] the Apostolic Prefecture of Tsiroanomandidy in Madagascar received additional territory taken from the Apostolic Prefecture of Morondava. In Tanganyika in British East Africa the Apostolic Vicariate of Mwanza received an additional district from the Apostolic Vicariate of Maswa in virtue of a decree of June 24, 1950;[25] and in the Belgian Congo the boundaries between the Apostolic Vicariate of Koango and that of Ipamu were readjusted by a decree of July 11, 1950.[26]

---

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 878.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 875.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 876.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 801.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 879.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 834.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 896.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 895.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 828.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 888.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 894.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 889.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 831.

In receiving the credential of the Ambassadors of Colombia and of Portugal, our Holy Father delivered appropriate allocutions on Nov. 14, 1950,[27] and Nov. 23, 1950,[28] respectively.

In the secret consistory held Dec. 11, 1950,[29] our Holy Father appointed Apostolic Legates for the closing of the Holy Doors as follows: for the Basilica of St. Paul's outside the Walls, Eugene Cardinal Tisserant; for the Lateran Basilica, Clemente Cardinal Micara; and for the Basilica of St. Mary Major, Alessandro Cardinal Verde. In this consistory he announced the appointment of the following members of the hierarchy (amongst a lengthy list of others):[30] Most Rev. Karl J. Alter, D.D., Archbishop of Cincinnati; Most Rev. Lawrence Graner, C.S.C., D.D., Archbishop of Dacca; Most Rev. Stephen S. Woznicki, D.D., Bishop of Saginaw; Most Rev. Alexander Zaleski, D.D., Bishop of Lyrbe and Auxiliary of Detroit; Most Rev. David F. Cunningham, D.D., Bishop of Lampsacus and Auxiliary of Syracuse; Most Rev. Adolph Noser, S.V.D., D.D., Bishop of Accra; Most Rev. Patrick J. McCormick, D.D., Bishop of Atenia and Auxiliary of Washington; Most Rev. Leonard Paul Hagarty, O.S.B., D.D., Bishop of Arba and Vicar Apostolic of the Bahamas; Most Rev. Eric F. MacKenzie, D.D., Bishop of Alba and Auxiliary of Boston; Most Rev. Thomas F. Markham, D.D., Bishop of Acalisso and Auxiliary of Boston; Most Rev. George J. Rehring, D.D., Bishop of Toledo; Most Rev. Francis P. Leipzig, D. D., Bishop of Baker City; Most

---

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 890.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 891.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 892.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 893.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 820.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 823.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 868.

[30] *Ibid.*, pp. 869-874.

Rev. Leo A. Pursley, D.D., Bishop of Hadrianopolis in Pisidia and Auxiliary of Fort Wayne; Most Rev. Merlin J. Guilfoyle, D.D., Bishop of Bulla and Auxiliary of San Francisco.

RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED IN THE *ACTA APOSTOLICAE SEDIS*

Assistants at the Pontifical Throne:

May 30, 1950: Most Rev. Karl J. Alter, D.D., Archbishop of Cincinnati.

Sept. 2, 1950: Most Rev. Henry P. Rohlman, D.D., Archbishop of Dubuque.

Protonotaries Apostolic ad instar participantium:

Nov. 30, 1949: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph Wurm, of the Diocese of Crookston.

Dec. 30, 1949: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Michael T. Costigan and Michael S. Roach, of the Diocese of Rapid City.

Jan. 17, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Daniel J. O'Beirne, of the Diocese of Natchez.

Feb. 22, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Louis J. Franey, of the Diocese of Rockford.

April 15, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph J. Glapinski, of the Diocese of Buffalo.

May 24, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgr. John M. McCarthy, of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

Aug. 21, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph E. Moylan, of the Diocese of Savannah-Atlanta.

Sept. 12, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis L. Phelan, of the Archdiocese of Boston.

Plaque of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

Dec. 15, 1949: Clarence E. Martin, of the Diocese of Richmond.

Grand Cross of the Order of St. Sylvester, Pope:

July 12, 1950: John Cuneo, of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Book Reviews

PATROLOGIE. Leben, Schriften und Lehre der Kirchenväter. By Berthold Altaner. Zweite, erweiterte Auflage. Freiburg-im-Breisgau: Herder, 1950. Pp. xx + 492.

Living in an unheated garret in Wurzburg, deprived of most of the ordinary conveniences of life as well as of his vast collection of notes, books, and the tools of scholarly endeavor, Professor Altaner has still been able to bring out the long-awaited second German edition of his *Patrologie*—by all odds the most complete and adequate coverage of the patristic field within the capacity of one tidy volume. The book is a *tour-de-force*, at once a tribute to the author's competence and diligence, and a token of charitable co-operation between scholars on an international scale that is worthy of widespread emulation.

In his preface, Professor Altaner himself points out the many improvements in the new edition: besides incorporating over a thousand new bibliographical titles, he has dealt with thirteen authors not mentioned before; and though he modestly confesses his inability to have completely encompassed the status of patrological progress as to the end of 1949, he has accomplished that task.

Though it may appear invidious amid such bibliographical wealth even to hint at a few omissions or imprecisions, the reviewer failed to find reference to A. Rademacher's "Koine" (*SAWW*—Vienna Academy—No. 5 [1947], 74 pp.); H. Rahner's *Abendländische Kirchenfreiheit* (Köln, 1943); P. Vannutelli's *Antologia patristica, A.D. 90-200* (2nd ed., Rome, 1942); R. Roques, "Note sur la notion de 'theologia' chez Ps. Dion. Areop." (*RAM*, XXV [1949], 200-12); R. Draguet, "Reminiscences de Pallade chez Cyrille de Scythopolis" (*ibid.*, pp. 213-18); A. Siegmund, *Die Überlieferung der Griech. christl. Literatur* (Munich, 1949: Mss. tradition). Also, E. J. Goodspeed is mistakenly numbered among the Catholic authors (p. 11). Some indication of P. Peeter's strictures on E. Schwartz's edition of the *Acta Oec. Conciliorum* might have been given (e.g. his several reviews and *AB* LIV [1937], pp. 143-46, etc.) in what is otherwise a good listing of the complicated documents encountered in that splendid edition. Nor is the opinion that Rufinus merely worked over the Church History of Gelasius of Caesarea for books x and xi of the H.E. as certain as Altaner indicates on pp. 202 and 344. Finally on p. 76, read O'Hare. The book is admirably printed and arranged. However, though it is perhaps too much to ask, a further great service might have been done by including an index of authors, for the convenience of the searching scholar.

This is of course an indispensable work, methodically improved over the course of the last ten years despite almost unsurmountable difficulties. In it the study of the Fathers of the Church receives an analysis and stimulus that cannot but benefit the whole ecclesiastical world. Its appearance now, and the fine reception it must be the object of everywhere, should be an added inducement to Professor Altaner to pursue with renewed determination the monumental History of Patrological Literature upon which he has been engaged for the past ten or fifteen years.

FRANCIS X. MURPHY, C.SS.R.

PATROLOGY. Vol. I: The Beginnings of Patristic Literature. By Johannes Quasten. Westminster, Md., and Utrecht-Brussels: Newman and Spectrum, 1950. Pp. xviii + 349. $5.00.

It is fitting that this book on the Beginnings of Patristic Literature should emanate from Catholic University. For it was there in 1908 that the eminent Bishop Thomas J. Shahan brought out his translation of Bardenhewer's one volume *Patrology* and caused a minor revolution in the study of the Church here in the United States. Since then, unfortunately, the textbooks on this subject have all likewise been translations of Tixeront, Cayré, Bardy—suffering from the limitations inherent in such efforts.

Fr. Quasten's first volume, covering the field from the earliest traces of the Apostle's Creed and the Didache to Irenaeus is an original work. Among its several features is the attempt to give not only an adequate idea of each author's works and theological thought but to illustrate such doctrinal intimations with apt and even long quotations of the author or document under discussion. The translations used for these citations are taken from the best of the newer series of such works including the Fathers of the Church, the Ancient Christian Writers, the SPCK, and the Loeb renditions, though no mention is made of the latter in the list of "Translations" on p. 16 while it is included in the "Abbreviations" (p. xv).

The decision to quote each bibliographical title at full length is to be applauded for thus the student and even the expert is given an opportunity to judge whether the citation is of immediate value to the project he has in mind; and the bibliography goes back on a selective but still adequate basis to the better works of the last century, thus obviating the annoyance of having to refer to the earlier editions of Rauschen and R.-Altaner when pursuing some particular point in Altaner.

The coverage of this *Patrology* is as complete as one could hope for in a manual its size. After a brief introduction to the study of the literary and monumental remains of the early Christian literature, the author gives a listing of the general and special works and sources that comprise the field with a clear and adequate indication of collections, editions, and commentaries both doctrinal and historico-philological wherein these texts and documents are contained or delineated. Much attention is given to the liturgical and canonical evidence that from the very beginning influenced the production of this literature.

The early part of the book deals with the development of the Creed, the Didache, the Letter of St. Clement of Rome and its several imitations, with an up to date discussion of the Pseudo-Clementine literature. Chapters follow on the Apocrypha—the early Christian folk stories, legends, and romances—the Beginnings of Christian Poetry (with an excursus on Abercius and Pectorius), and the Acts of the Martyrs.

The Greek apologists are studied at length. There is an extensive treatment of the heretical literature that takes into account such recent discoveries of modern scholarship as the collection of thirty-seven Gnostic documents found in Egypt in 1946. A final chapter deals with the anti-heretical writings of the second century with emphasis upon the popes of the period and particular attention given to Hegesippus and Irenaeus. Excellent indices round out the volume.

Dr. Quasten dates the Didache between A.D. 100 and 150 electing for a Syriac origin, while he favors a two-part composition for the Shepherd of Hermes traceable to the pontificates of Clement and Pius. He feels that Dom Andreissen's recent contention that the Letter to Diognetus was composed by Quadratus re-opens the whole question of the authorship of that gem-like document.

On the question of Irenaeus and the Roman primacy, Fr. Quasten along with Altaner follows A. Ehrhard (*Die Kirche der Märtyrer* [Munich, 1932], pp. 277 f.), translating the "propter potentiorem principalitatem" as "because of its more efficient leadership"—*wirksamere Führerschaft;* better, perhaps, "effective" or "actual"—thus referring the whole passage not to the Church's juridical primacy but to the prestige of its unimpeachable faith in which it precedes all the churches. In thus not directly opting for an evident reference to the constitutional primacy, Fr. Quasten is merely reflecting the views of modern patrologists like Duchesne and Bardy who, however, prefer "its superior origin" as a rendition of the *principalitatem.* Fr. Quasten does not rule out the primacy in this passage, and he has already underlined the strong evidence for that prerogative in its practical exercise as witnessed to by Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch.

On theological lines there are several inadequacies that might be noted. Dealing with the value of patristic testimony for example (pp. 10-12), Fr. Quasten quotes both Vincent of Lerins and Cardinal Newman, but does not give a clear statement of the relationship between the authority of the Fathers as such and the universal magisterium of the Church—a point that could well have been elaborated in the light of the recent definition of the Assumption despite the absolute silence of patristic sources on the subject to at least the sixth century. Similarly, in speaking of the Trinitarian formula of the creed (p. 25), insufficient attention is given to the overwhelming amount of recent research pointing to a definite formula of profession of faith that was independent of, though it grew out of, the baptismal form (cf. e.g., J. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* [New York and London: 1950], pp. 23-40).

Inevitably a few minor blemishes have been noticed. On p. 2 read Chrysostom(e); p. 31, points; p. 52, O. Cullmann; p. 245, J. Danielou. Insufficient attention is paid to LeNain de Tillemont (p. 5) as one of the first great patrologists whose opinions and suggestions are still invaluable to the student of the Fathers. P. Vannutelli's fine *Antologia patristica, A.D. 90-200* (2nd ed., Rome, 1942), and D. Gorce's *Petite introduction,* along with his *Newman et les Pères* (2nd ed., Beyaert, 1947) were missed in the introductory bibliographies, as well as J. de Ghellinck's article on "Les recherches patristiques, progres et problèmes" in *Mélanges offerts au R. P. F. Cavallera* (Toulouse, 1948), pp. 65-85. Père de Ghellinck's *Patristique et moyen âge,* vol. I (on the history of the Creed) appeared in a second, amplified edition in 1949 just before his death. L. Christiani's article on "S. Ignace d'Antioch, sa vie d'intimité avec J. C." (*RAM,* XXV [1949], pp. 107-16) might also have been mentioned.

This is an excellent volume that should be adopted as the textbook on patrology in our seminaries and colleges, for it is an interesting and adequate introduction to the subject; and it is soon to be enhanced by the two succeeding volumes, one on the Latin Fathers to Gregory the Great, and the other on the Greek Fathers to John Damascene—volumes which are already on their way to the printer. Fr. Quasten and the Spectrum Press are to be congratulated further on the large type, the commodious layout, and the well turned binding in which the volume appears: a truly fine piece of scholarly workmanship all around.

FRANCIS X. MURPHY, C.SS.R.

THE LEFT HAND OF GOD. By William E. Barrett. New York: Doubleday, 1951. Pp. 275. $3.00.

MANY COLORED FLEECE. Edited by Sister Mariella Gable, O.S.B. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1950. Pp. 336. $3.50.

"'Oh! it is only a novel.' replies the young lady, while she lays down her book with affected indifference, or momentary shame. 'It is only Cecilia, or Camilla, or Belinda': or in short, only some work in which the most thorough knowledge of human nature, the happiest delineation of its varieties, the liveliest effusions of wit and humour are conveyed to the world in the best chosen language." Miss Austen's sanguine testimony is submitted in behalf of a *genre* rather than any particular representatives thereof, in the faint hope of inclining some who "haven't time for that sort of thing" toward an examination of their potential undernourishment and loss. "Potential" is unquestionably the word in the case of Edward Barrett's yarn, "actual" more to the point in discussing a number of Sister Mariella's inclusions. Despite vast literary differences, it will nonetheless have proved wiser to acquaint oneself with the fleecing attempted by hireling Jim Carmody than with the black sheep and white of the anthologist's fold-of-the-world if one is successfully to get past the hazard of census visits, parochial, and priestly gatherings these next few months.

Barrett is a thoroughly reverent slickster able to reproduce the dialogue of hollow men with precision. He has got off fifty pages of "no-worse-than-Cronin-surely" before the proceedings begin to creak. By the second fifty a number of well-meaning faculty men in places like Techny, Ossining, and St. Columban's, Neb., should be prepared to hang up their track shoes. "Father Peter O'Shea," having cut the Carmody, has won the *bravium* (properly accented), in a walk. In his ruse for escape from the war-lord Mieh Yang, the flier has not merely touched a hem but donned a garment, and he feels the oddly embarrassed evil go out of him. A liberal sprinkling of wild imaginings mar the book (". . . the Latin rolled easily from his tongue as the man recited his act of contrition"—oh, that first absolution read stumblingly from a card in the bright light of a June morning!), but of a kind that should escape those who puzzle that it need take six years to "learn the Mass." God's purposes with men, His awesome love, and the fierce strength of chastity merit beautiful handling in places. One may smile at the bar sinister on the escutcheon of the character of order. One must not be too surprised when the reluctant ringer of the rectory bell names these pages as a grace that helped to bring him there.

With Sister Mariella's friends it is a different matter. Paul Horgan draws an old French missionary, Bryan MacMahon tells you what